

nickel which purport to carry a priority rating. In order to assist you in determining what orders may properly be regarded by you as entitled to priority we are advising you as follows:

The basic rules of the priorities system are set forth in BDSA (formerly NPA), regulation 2. Additional regulations relating to the use of priority ratings are DMS regulations 1 and 2. Marked copies of these regulations are enclosed. Under unusual circumstances ratings may be placed under certain other regulations but for all practical purposes you may expect that any lawful ratings will require certification under one of the three regulations designated above.

You will note that in addition to the requirement of inclusion of the appropriate program identification symbol there is a requirement that every rated order be certified and signed by the customer. The certification must be in the form "Certified under [here insert appropriate regulation]." Orders not carrying this formula are of questionable validity as rated orders. It is a further requirement that rated orders specify a delivery date.

We understand that some of your customers have sought to identify their orders as rated orders without complying with the formalities required by the regulations. In our opinion this is an irregular practice and orders in this form should not be treated as entitled to priority. We point out that orders not properly rated are junior to rated orders. Properly rated orders must be filled first, irrespective of the degree of shortage.

We should like also to draw your attention to section 18 of BDSA (formerly NPA), regulation 2. Under this section, if you know or have reason to believe that the material which you are delivering will be of any regulation of this agency, you accepted, redelivered, held, or used in violation of any regulation of this agency, you are neither required nor authorized to deliver on such order. It has come to our attention that in certain cases orders have been placed by customers who may, to your knowledge, not have facilities adequate to process or use the materials ordered by them on priority ratings. We regard this as a suspicious circumstance and as one which justifies withholding delivery until the validity of the purported rating has been established to your satisfaction or to that of this agency.

An additional circumstance which gives rise to question as to the authenticity of a rated order is purported certification under a nonexistent regulation such as CMP Regs. 1, 2 and 3. These regulations have long since been revoked and have not been in effect since the controlled materials plan was superseded by the Defense Materials System in 1953. Another suspicious circumstance is the use of nonexistent program identification symbols. The only symbols currently in effect are A through E followed by a single digit.

Because of the critical shortage of nickel an incentive exists to resort to illegal practices and subterfuges to obtain it. Nickel obtained by these practices at normal market prices can be resold in the "black" or "gray"

market at exorbitant figures. The priorities accorded to military and AEC orders under the regulations of this agency are to all intents and purposes the equivalent of currency and must be safeguarded against counterfeiting or falsification just as currency is safeguarded. While experience has demonstrated that we can largely rely upon the good faith and integrity of the business public to assist us in protecting the priorities system against raids we are nevertheless prepared when necessary to take appropriate measures against willful violators.

You are in a position to make a significant contribution to the welfare of the Nation and of your industry by assisting in the prevention of violations. We urge you to insist upon strict observance on the part of your customers with the requirements of the system and to refrain from accepting or filling, on a priority basis, "rated" orders which are either irregular in form or of such doubtful validity as to create a reasonable doubt of the customer's authority to employ the rating. You are further requested to communicate the contents of this letter to all personnel in your organization who are charged with the soliciting of orders from customers and the processing of orders received from customers so that they may be fully apprised of your policy to insist upon adherence to the requirements of law.

Sincerely yours,

JONATHAN B. RINTELS,
Enforcement Attorney for Business
and Defense Services Administration.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 3, 1956

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 26, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Peter Jacobs, assistant pastor, St. Margaret's Church, Seat Pleasant, Md., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, creator of heaven and earth; enlighten, guide, strengthen, and console this great lawmaking body. Inspire us in what we ought to do, and then command us to do it. Lord, make us instruments of Thy peace; where there is hatred, let us sow love; where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; and where there is sadness, joy.

O Divine Master, grant that we may not so much seek to be consoled as to console; to be understood, as to understand; to be loved, as to love; for it is in giving that we receive; it is in pardoning that we are pardoned; and it is in dying that we are born to eternal life. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 30, 1956,

The following message from the House of Representatives was received by the Secretary of the Senate:

The message communicated to the Senate resolutions of the House, adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, late a Senator of the United States from the State of Kentucky; formerly Vice President of the

United States and a former Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Kentucky.

The message announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7500. An act to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure;

H. R. 8228. An act to suspend for 2 years the duty on crude bauxite and on calcined bauxite;

H. R. 8615. An act to provide wage credits under title II of the Social Security Act for military service before July 1, 1959 (the termination date for inductions into the Armed Forces), and to permit application for lump-sum benefits under such title to be made within 2 years after interment or reinterment in the case of service men dying overseas before such date; and

H. R. 10899. An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 907. An act for the relief of Justin G. Maile and Théodore R. Hilbig;

H. R. 1470. An act for the relief of Joseph Righetti and Marjorie Righetti;

H. R. 1500. An act for the relief of Charles F. Brickell;

H. R. 1603. An act to terminate the prohibition against employment of Mongolian labor in the construction of reclamation projects;

H. R. 2068. An act for the relief of William F. Friedman;

H. R. 2465. An act for the relief of Bernard L. Denn;

H. R. 2898. An act for the relief of the F. Dalzio Co., Inc.;

H. R. 4118. An act to amend section 606 (5) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to the computation of the 10-year recapture period;

H. R. 4781. An act to authorize the Territory of Alaska to incur indebtedness, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4791. An act to amend section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act, so as to increase salaries for part-time and full-time referees;

H. R. 4852. An act for the relief of Joseph Gangemi and Anthony Gangemi;

H. R. 4865. An act for the relief of Stanley Rydzon and Alexander F. Anderson;

H. R. 4872. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen Barsa;

H. R. 5626. An act for the relief of Fred Mazan;

H. R. 5634. An act for the relief of Willie C. Pickett, George Williams, and Herman L. Looney;

H. R. 6282. An act for the relief of Nathan L. Garner;

H. R. 7952. An act to require the inspection and certification of certain vessels carrying passengers;

H. R. 8535. An act to amend the act of July 4, 1955, relating to the construction of irrigation distribution systems; and

H. J. Res. 513. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built cargo vessels and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

H. R. 7500. An act to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8228. An act to suspend for 2 years the duty on crude bauxite and on calcined bauxite; and

H. R. 8615. An act to provide wage credits under title II of the Social Security Act for

military service before July 1, 1959 (the termination date for inductions into the Armed Forces), and to permit application for lump-sum benefits under such title to be made within 2 years after interment or reinterment in the case of servicemen dying overseas before such date; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 10899. An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 30, 1956,

The following reports of committees were submitted:

On May 1, 1956:

By Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 6143. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that for taxable years beginning after May 31, 1950, certain amounts received in consideration of the transfer of patent rights shall be considered capital gain regardless of the basis upon which such amounts were paid; with amendments (Rept. No. 1941).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2582. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of William E. Stone for disability retirement as a Reserve officer or Army of the United States officer under the provisions of the act of April 3, 1939, as amended (Rept. No. 1942);

S. 3472. A bill for the relief of Patricia A. Pembroke (Rept. No. 1943);

H. R. 4051. A bill to provide for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1945);

H. R. 8187. A bill for the relief of Wright H. Huntley; (Rept. No. 1946);

H. R. 4536. A bill for the relief of John J. Cowin (Rept. No. 1947);

H. R. 4633. A bill for the relief of Crosse & Blackwell Co. (Rept. No. 1948);

H. R. 5495. A bill for the relief of Arthur H. Homeyer (Rept. No. 1949); and

H. R. 6395. A bill for the relief of Thomas W. Bevans and others (Rept. No. 1950).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H. R. 4162. A bill for the relief of Kahzo L. Harris (Rept. No. 1951).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H. R. 3964. A bill for the relief of Kingan, Inc. (Rept. No. 1944).

On May 2, 1956:

By Mr. SMATHERS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

H. R. 7471. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Board of Commissioners of St. Johns County, Fla.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1952).

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, because of the sudden death last Monday of our beloved colleague, Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky, it is not contemplated that any business will be transacted by the Senate today further than action on a resolution to be submitted in a few minutes.

It is planned that the next session of the Senate will be held on Monday next. Under the rules of the Senate, the so-called District of Columbia transit bill will retain its status as the unfinished

business, and its consideration will be proceeded with on that day.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it be to meet on Monday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEATH OF SENATOR ALBEN W. BARKLEY, OF KENTUCKY

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], who is absent from the Senate, attending the funeral of the late Senator BARKLEY, in Paducah, Ky., I submit a resolution, and ask for its present consideration. It is the purpose that at a later time a day will be set aside upon which appropriate eulogies may be pronounced by the colleagues of the late Senator in the Senate, and at this time I merely ask for action on the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 258) as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, late a Senator from the State of Kentucky and a former Vice President of the United States.

Resolved, That a committee be appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall be a member of the committee, to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator at Paducah, Ky.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and unanimously agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to the second resolving clause, the Chair appoints, as the committee to attend the funeral of the late Senator, in addition to the Vice President, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PUR-

TELL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPLE], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. WOFFORD].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate stand in adjournment until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 7, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 3, 1956

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Valerian S. Karcz, Assumption Church, New Chicago, Ind., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who dost preside over the destinies of men and nations, Lord God of Hosts, reverently we lift up our eyes to Thee to bestow Thy abundant blessing upon our beloved country, as we again proclaim and establish the ideals and principles of a God-fearing democracy.

On this 165th anniversary of the adoption of the progressive and liberal constitution of the 3d of May by freedom-loving Poland, we solemnly pause to call upon the testimony of history and all free peoples to vindicate the rights of our ever-glorious ally.

Devoted sons of chivalrous Poland everywhere in the world today prayerfully raise their hearts to Thee, Eternal Father, to restore to the people of Poland in keeping with Thy divine designs their inalienable rights to liberty and justice.

O Thou, blessed Saviour of mankind, who didst die on the cross and through suffering and death didst open the gates of heaven, deign to grant to the peoples of Poland and of all nations, suffering and persecuted, courage to persevere in their Christian ideals and to attain the triumphant glory of the resurrection.

And Thou, O Holy Spirit, bountifully endow the President of the United States, and the Members of Congress, and all who hold positions of leadership and authority throughout the world, with Thy septenary gifts that they may courageously pursue the paths of true and enduring peace, established upon Thy eternal law. We ask Thee, O God, to hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE POLISH CONSTITUTION OF 1791

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, many friends of the Polish people join in celebrating the anniversary of the promulgation of an instrument which, in its day, symbolized a noteworthy step toward freedom—the Polish Constitution of 1791. Another famous instrument of that period comes to mind: The American Declaration of Independence of 1776, which proclaimed that man was endowed with certain inalienable rights and that for the protection of these rights “governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.” The Polish Constitution closely follows our own form of representative government as initiated by our Founding Fathers.

Poland has for a long time been the battleground of Europe. The courageous stands of the Polish people in the face of tyrants and aggressors on innumerable occasions have been illustrations of courage unparalleled in history.

Well over a century and a half have passed since that era when freedom seemed to blow like a fresh wind through old Europe and what was then the New World. In those days men pledged their fortunes, their honor, and their very lives to the sacred cause of liberty—and more often than not were called upon to fulfill their pledges. Polish patriots fought for liberty in the United States and American patriots applauded when ancient tyrannies seemed to be on the wane in Poland.

Today Poland languishes under the heel of an old enemy, the Soviet Union. Employing new forms of totalitarianism, the Soviet Union has sought to enslave not only the bodies but the minds and hearts of the Polish and other subject peoples.

The new tyranny is more subtle, all-pervasive, and stronger than any Poland has ever been called upon to endure. It imposes upon that unhappy nation a dictator government maintained by a Soviet-dominated secret police and Soviet-dominated armed forces. It forces the Polish economy to fit into the pattern of Soviet needs to the impoverishment of the Polish people. Worst of all, it constantly assails the minds and souls of the people of Poland with a pagan Communist philosophy.

However, on this 165th anniversary of the Polish Constitution a burning desire for freedom remains a prime quality of the Polish people, nourished by decades of resistance to cruelty and oppression. Those of us who are familiar with the true spirit of the Polish people know that they will find ways to overcome this, as they have other tyrannies. Even now, as the bloody dissensions of the Stalin dictatorship are revealed, the flame of hope flickers into new life. This confusion of their slavemasters may bring new opportunities for freedom to all Soviet-subjected peoples.

I join with Americans of Polish descent and friends of Poland throughout the free world in looking forward to happier days—days when the Polish people will have overthrown alien domination,

when their God-given rights to think and act as they desire are protected by their own freely elected government.

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, seeds of democracy have been scattered somewhat sparsely in various places, at different times, and under differing circumstances. We in the free world would like to think of the West as the natural habitat of democratic ideas and ideals; certainly this has been true in the case of Western Europe and in some of its offshoots in the Americas. In the course of the 18th century when such invigorating and infectious ideas were spreading like wildfire in many parts of the West, governments of Eastern Europe, particularly countries governed by autocratic monarchs, were trying hard to build dams and raise curtains against such dangerous ideas. In the midst of such reactionary rulers, liberal and progressive leaders of Poland tried to evolve, early in the last decade of the 18th century, a document which by the standards of those days was a model democratic constitution.

That constitution was enacted into law on May 3 of 1791, a date memorable in the annals of Poland's modern history. By its very terms many progressive social and political reforms were introduced into the governmental machinery. The powers of the King were reduced and circumscribed while those of the elected Chamber of Deputies were enhanced and enlarged. Serfs were given personal liberty and guaranteed equality of rights. Peasants were given the right of representation in the national government and the towns were also given certain rights. In short, one finds the beginnings of numerous future social, economic, and political reforms in that constitution. For its progressive provisions this document was heartily approved by Edmund Burke, perhaps the leading political thinker of the Anglo-Saxon world at the time. Unfortunately, however, the turns of international events prevented the realization of these ideals.

The adoption of this constitution seemed to have alarmed Poland's envious and avaricious neighbors. Realizing that by this constitution Poland might become strong, and thereby a real force in the politics of Eastern Europe, Austrian, Prussian, and Russian autocrats at once decided to put an end to the Polish state by dividing it among themselves. Of course, the poor Poles could not forestall such a combination of powers, and in a short time independent Poland was no more. But the ideas and ideals of the constitution of May 1791 lived on in Poland for more than 100 years; and they were fully realized in the regenerated republican Poland in 1918. At the beginning of World War

II those ideas had to be shelved once more, and since then their only safe abode seem to be the hearts of the freedom-loving and stout-hearted Polish people.

Today in celebrating the 165th anniversary of that constitution, we all hope and pray that soon those fine and noble democratic ideas, so plainly embodied in that constitution, will be planted once more on the fertile soil of Poland, there to live and grow and blossom.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on Poland's Constitution Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 165th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. Back on May 3, 1791, the people of Poland instituted their constitution. Like our own Federal and State constitutions, that document is one of the great monuments which men have erected from time to time in support of the human right of self-determination and equality before the law. This constitution expressed the Polish people's belief in individual liberty. It contained this clear, true statement:

All power in civil society is derived from the will of the people.

Today even though Poland has been subjugated to the might of godless communism, people throughout the world still look on the Polish Constitution as a symbol of the day when Poland will again be free. In my Eighth Congressional District of Massachusetts, we have many fine citizens—outstanding citizens—of Polish descent who are completely steeped in the principles of freedom and who are bitterly unhappy over the continued denial of freedom to their friends and relatives behind the Iron Curtain. Our present laws of immigration and red tape make it difficult if not impossible for escapees from Communist terror behind the Iron Curtain to be admitted into the United States. This naturally rankles our Americans of Polish descent because of the implication that Polish people who want to come here provide some kind of special security risk. No such implication is justified. It is because these Poles love freedom so deeply that they try to escape from behind the Iron Curtain. People so imbued with a love of freedom make, and have made, outstanding citizens of our free country.

What do the Poles think of their Communist overlords? Any of you who know the Polish people who are in America today realize that communism is alien to the basic nature of a Pole. At this very moment, Poland is under the domination of an ideology foreign and repugnant to the great bulk of her people.

As a nation the Poles are proud of their great deeds and accomplishments, and they are fully justified in that pride.

Not only are they well known as diligent and skillful workers, but they are equally well known as accomplished masters in the arts and the sciences. They are no less famous as brave and courageous warriors. The names of all the Poles who have staked their lives for freedom and liberty are too numerous to mention. Of the many Poles who have taken an active part in struggles for liberty, two that perhaps are best known to the people of our country because of their roles in our Revolutionary War, are Kosciusko and Pulaski.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Poland have the right to know that we in America, who owe so much to those of Polish birth, cherish the thought that a free and sovereign Poland will one day rise again. Today, when liberty-loving Poles celebrate their national holiday and the anniversary of their constitution, they should be plainly given the encouragement that is inherent in the simple fact that we have not forgotten them.

This anniversary of the Polish constitution of 1791 provides a proper occasion for us to rededicate ourselves to the cause of oppressed Poland. To a great extent this cause of Poland is our cause, because it has its roots in a desire for freedom. And, so long as Poland and the other oppressed nations of the world do not enjoy the blessings of liberty, the world itself will never know peace, security, and progress.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, May 3 marks the anniversary of one of the great human documents of the age of democracy, the Polish Constitution of 1791—a document including guaranties of religious toleration and freedom of thought that compare favorably with the guaranties in our own Constitution.

The Polish people have been victimized beyond the experience of most European peoples by conquest, partition, invasion, oppression across centuries. They are held today as the creatures of a government satellite to the Soviet Union and maintained in power only by the Red army.

But under the successive oppressions of the past the Polish people never lost their sense of nationalism and never lost their dedication to the principles of freedom. These emotions were so strong within them that after nearly a century and a half of foreign occupation, Poland rose again. Poland will rise yet once more as an independent nation, capable of asserting her right to self-government.

Poland sent her finest spirits, General Pulaski and General Kosciusko, to fight with the armies of George Washington and to help the infant States of America win their freedom.

Poland has given great creative artists and composers, scientists, and philosophers, to help build the modern nature of the Western World. Polish armies fought bravely on many fields of conflict in World War II, as they had fought previously in earlier wars of liberation, for the principle of independence and the overthrow of tyranny.

The Poles have been used most evilly in their present subservience to Moscow. It is important that in whatever manner we can we speak the words that, when transmitted, will let the Polish people

know that they are not forgotten, that they have friends here in America and other democratic countries who will never forget them.

The reestablishment of Poland as a truly sovereign nation, free to guide her own destinies, is an objective that we must never allow too far from our thoughts and memories. When the day comes again that Poland is free, the celebration of her great Constitution Day will be a celebration in which all of aspiring mankind can share.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege at this time to invite your attention to the fact that today marks the 165th anniversary of the institution of Poland's Constitution. Let us in America take note of a nation that remains even today a symbol of man's eternal fight for individual liberty.

I say even today because, as we all know, Poland is at present under the cruel shadow of her Communist oppressor, the Soviet Union. Let us remind ourselves of Poland's recent tragic past. The German attack on Poland on September 1, 1939, was the first application of the Nazi's blitzkrieg. Poland soon found herself under German rule and her people had then to go underground to resume their fight for freedom. In a series of heart-rending events, the Nazi yoke over Poland fell into the hands of the Communists. Additional tyranny was heaped upon these courageous people.

A Communist puppet government was then set up, holding the people in its vice-like grip and following the devastating pattern of Communist totalitarianism. Today, freedom is completely suppressed in Poland. The Polish army is at the command of the Soviets who run it with thousands of Soviet officers. The school system, the youth organizations, the trade unions, and universities have all become parts of the Soviet machine. Wholesale arrests and mass murder keep the Communist Party in power. The Poles are tortured in mind and body by their totalitarian masters.

We in America have a deep sympathy and concern for the Polish people. Surely no people on earth have demonstrated more clearly over the years their undying love of liberty than the Polish people.

We hear much in these days about coexistence; the word coexistence was first of all mouthed by the hypocritical Soviets probably in the hope that the Western World would relax its attitude of vigilance; but now we hear it expressed as the pious hope of some of our own people who are dreaming of an easy way out of our present difficulties. The Polish people know from sad experience that there is no easy way out and no true coexistence with communism. We in our mature judgment surely realize that we cannot exist peacefully with murders, oppressors, with men in whom there is no sense of honor, or with an ideology whose only goal is the death of liberty.

Neither the Polish people nor we in America can ever accept the present condition of Poland's existence. A nation enslaved calls for our help. We continue to look to total freedom as the

goal for the Polish Nation. The American people will never cease to work for this goal. We know that the tyrant will be thrown off.

I count it a great privilege to send words of warm and prayerful encouragement to these noble folk on this their great anniversary.

THE PATRIOTISM AND STABILITY OF THE POLISH PEOPLE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, in their long history the Polish people have had little opportunity to enjoy freedom, yet they have constantly and valiantly struggled to attain it. Despite the sufferings of invasions, partitions, and occupations, Polish patriotism has never faltered.

It was love of liberty denied them in their homeland that brought many Poles to our shores. Poland's loss was our gain, for their contributions in our struggle to earn and retain our freedom were vital.

Since the days of the American Revolution Polish blood has been shed for the preservation of American liberty. Such patriots as Thaddeus Kosciusko and Casimir Pulaski and almost a thousand other Polish patriots fought for the Continental Army. During the Mexican, Civil, and Spanish-American Wars Americans of Polish descent died for the preservation of American freedom. More recently, during World War I, 300,000 Polish-Americans served in defense of their adopted country, and in World War II more than 900,000 served.

As Polish patriotism contributed to the security of our country their stability aided in its development. The Polish immigrants come to America endowed with a capacity for assiduousness and a love of God. The Poles are not afraid of work. They cultivated our soil; constructed our railroads; developed our coal, iron, and copper mines; and as they gained proficiency, contributed to the expansion of our industry. Their religious faith has also made them peaceful, loyal, and law-abiding citizens.

Our Polish-Americans have helped in building American civilization and culture. The cultural achievements of Poland have become part of the varied culture of America. The Poles have also contributed to the spiritual and religious growth of our country.

Today, the anniversary of Polish Constitution Day, is an appropriate occasion for all Americans to express their appreciation to all Polish-Americans for their contributions in the defense and development of our great country. It is also an opportune time to assure Americans of Polish descent that we will join in their prayers for their enslaved relatives and friends in their native land.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, May 3 marks the anniversary of one of the great landmarks in humanity's struggle for liberty. On that date in 1791 the statesmen of Poland signed the document now famous as the Polish Constitution of May 3. The great constitution incorporated in its articles a sense of justice and protection of liberty theretofore unknown in eastern Europe. But the liberal ideas that had blossomed among the Polish people and finally culminated in a democratic constitution alarmed the ruling monarch of powerful

Russia. Soon Russian troops invaded Poland, crushed the small army of Polish troops that managed for 3 months to valiantly defend their homeland, and brought an end to the Polish experiment in democratic government.

But the spirit of the document could not be broken by force of arms. It lived on in the hearts of the Polish people, strengthening them in their resistance to tyranny and sustaining them in their dark hours. It surged up in the fateful year of 1939 when the Polish people stood up with great valor to defend their institutions against Hitler's cynical invasion. And even now, over 160 years since its inauguration, the spirit of the constitution of May 3 continues to provide the oppressed people of Poland with a spiritual sustenance to resist the new tyranny of Soviet Russia. In spite of the brutal liquidation of political opposition, the relentless persecution of the church, and the ruthless imposition of communism, we know from all reports that the brave people of Poland still cherish their principles of national independence and human liberty.

The decanonization of Stalin by the current rulers of the Kremlin must seem ironic indeed to the Polish people. As victims of Stalin's inhuman treatment, they have been decrying all along what only now the new crop of Soviet leaders seem to have discovered. But the new oppressors are overly optimistic if they think they can erase the memory of the Katyn massacre or the subsequent harsh Soviet domination of Poland by shoving all the blame upon the corpse of Stalin. Only when the Polish people are again free to direct their own destinies, to freely engage in their traditional political, cultural, and religious activities, will the West begin to believe that the Kremlin has really changed its policy.

It is my fervent hope on this anniversary of the Polish constitution of May 3 that the courageous Polish people will be shortly rewarded for their faith in the noble principles embodied in that great document and for their perseverance in pursuing their ideals.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 165th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, a constitution adopted a few years after ours and patterned after ours. While we jealously guard the rights and privileges granted to us under our Constitution, the Polish people have lost all rights, all privileges, all independence bestowed upon them 165 years ago, and have become an enslaved nation.

Information coming to us from Poland leads us to believe that the younger generation has become one of the mainstays of resistance against the Communist Government. Even though most of their education has been along Communist lines, their positions as civil servants, engineers, officers of the armed forces, Government officials, and so forth, have given them an opportunity to learn firsthand what Communist "democracy" is, and they have been very much disillusioned. The Communist line will never replace the fierce patriotism which burns in the hearts of the Polish people.

In addition to its youth, the Polish workers, peasants, and members of the

Catholic Church are further bulwarks against the Communist government. Let us not be misled by statements of collaboration with the so-called People's Government, by various groups in Poland. Such statements are made for propaganda purposes only, but cannot deceive those who know the Polish people and the Polish spirit of resistance, demonstrated so remarkably in the fight against Hitler's invading forces in 1939.

Our Government must do everything possible to encourage these people in their resistance and refusal to bow to their captors. The present Soviet rulers pretend to be aghast at the atrocities and injustices carried out by the Stalin government. Let us take advantage of their new attitude and urge them to release all political prisoners; admit their guilt in the Katyn Forest massacre, in which 15,000 Polish officers were murdered; free Poland and other nations enslaved during the Stalin regime by giving them an opportunity to hold free elections under the supervision of the United Nations, so they may decide their own form of government and choose those persons whom they would have lead their countries as free and independent nations.

This is the greatest opportunity we have had since the close of the war to further the cause of the enslaved nations. Let us take advantage of it and do everything possible to force the Soviet rulers to prove that they are sincere in their abhorrence of Stalin's crimes or to prove to the world that their present pious protestations are mere hypocritical statements, intended to mislead and deceive the free nations of the world.

I strongly urge the administration to take advantage of this golden opportunity which would strengthen the hopes and beliefs of the captive nations and their continued resistance to Soviet rule, as nothing else could. Such action by our Government would speed the day when Poland and other enslaved nations would again join the free nations of the world.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, May 3, 1791, 165 years ago today, marks a memorable date in the history of Poland. It was on that date that the Polish Constitution was adopted, and it is on such an anniversary as this that all of the peoples of the free world are prone to reflect the struggle and sacrifice made by this nation to preserve the principles of freedom and human dignity contained in that historic document.

Even though Poland has been subjugated several times by foreign aggression since the adoption of its constitution, its spirit of independence and its devotion to God have never wavered. I am, therefore, certain that with the continuance of these ideals, Poland will surmount the Communist tyranny with which it is confronted today and will rise once again as a free nation.

It is with this hope that I today join all of the Americans of Polish ancestry in their observance of Polish Constitution Day.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on the third of May 1791, on this day, 165 years ago, barely 3 years after our adoption of the creed of liberty and freedom

of man took place, the Polish Constitution was promulgated. The people of Poland threw off the chains of antiquated government and embraced a document that embodied those liberties for which they had long striven.

In retrospect, we realize that the years following the signing of the Polish Constitution have not been easy for this brave country. Torn by bloodshed, maimed by war, crippled by the bonds placed upon her by despotic rulers, Poland has been conquered but courageous always. The words of Talleyrand after the Council of Vienna may still be made applicable to the future heritage of the Polish Nation:

The Poles no longer have a common country, but they have a common language. They will remain, then, united by the strongest and most durable of bonds. They will arrive, under foreign domination, to the age of manhood, and the moment they reach that age, will not be far from that in which, emancipated, they will all be attached once more to one center.

This historic day marks the incipience of the struggle of the Polish Nation against the exponents of injustice and tyranny, against the dominating influence of its geographical neighbors, and against the forces of political enslavement. The fight is not yet over. But through the never-ending, always burning spirit of the people of Poland, she will once again be free—free to live in the democracy born on May 3, 1791—born never to die.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, May 3 is the 165th anniversary of the Polish Constitution Day. I would like to send my best wishes to Polish Americans on the occasion of the celebration of that glorious day. Unfortunately, however, the land of their ancestors will not be openly celebrating this event; for today Poland is temporarily enslaved by the godless Communists. I say temporarily, for a Nation having such a tradition for love of liberty, justice, and freedom of worship will never be permanently subjugated by this ruthless tyranny.

Periodically Poland has been enslaved by oppressors. However, history shows that the conquerors have never been successful in keeping the gallant Poles under subjugation long.

Concrete evidence of Poland's refusal to yield to foreign despots was her courageous revolt against the Prussian and Russian invaders shortly after the first partition of her country in 1772. Each successive partition has been countered with equally vigorous resistance.

Today, the fifth partition of the country by the Communists has forced the Polish people to relinquish, once again, their fundamental freedoms. The Reds, conscious of Poland's valiant struggles in the past to retain her liberty, concentrated their attack on the ruthless suppression of nationalism and religion.

To accomplish this, the Communists attempted to impose the doctrines of Marx and Lenin on the Polish people. By the elimination of Polish culture and replacing it with Soviet ideology, the Reds hoped to insure loyalty to the state.

The propagation of communism was followed by the persecution of religion; for the Kremlin was aware that unless atheism supplanted the worship of God, Sovietization would never be complete.

However, despite terror tactics of slave labor, deportation, and genocide employed by the Reds to accomplish these ends, the Polish people have never lost their desire for freedom and they have kept their faith. Incessantly, they continue to resist complete Communist indoctrination by the atheistic Kremlin.

I wish to take the opportunity on this anniversary of Polish Constitution Day to express my confidence that the present enslavement of Poland will not endure. As in the past, Polish nationalism and love of liberty, justice, and freedom of worship will prevail over despotism.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the Polish Constitution, which is commemorated today was adopted more than a century and a half ago. In the year 1772 the states of Prussia, Russia and Austria fell upon Poland and, in what is known as the first partition, despoiled her of about one-fourth of her territory. This event had a strong effect on Polish opinion and when certain international developments presented a favorable opportunity the Poles took vigorous measures to strengthen their government. The result was the convening of the "Four Years' Diet" in 1788.

This famous Diet voted a series of fundamental reforms and on May 3, 1791, just 4 years after the American Constitution was written, it accepted one of the first written constitutions of Europe. This document abolished many vestiges of the old political system and converted Poland into a hereditary monarchy with ministerial responsibility.

The constitution of 1791, which was based upon the American Declaration of Independence and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man, is one for which the Polish people should be commended and praised. It embodied some of the most liberal governmental concepts of its day. It recognized greater privileges for the townsmen and the peasants and established religious toleration.

The constitution was written with the hope of giving enough stability to Poland to discourage aggressive plans of neighboring powers. However, within the space of a few years, Russia, Prussia and Austria divided up Poland in two successive partitions and destroyed its independence.

No people in all history have demonstrated a greater appreciation of freedom than the Polish people. Nor have any sacrificed more, or will sacrifice more for freedom. The fires of liberty for Poland still flame in the hearts of her people, despite their present subjection to the Communists. These fires will grow and grow; until, once again, they sweep away the oppressors of Poland. Righteousness cannot be permanently obscured by the oppression of despotism. Justice and liberty cannot be destroyed, and while Poles live, Poland will live.

Let us remember the first Polish Constitution was supported and defended

by the Polish King Stanislas Augustus II, a man of rare wisdom and a patriot who said that his ideas on the constitution were "only the dreams of a good citizen." Let us thank God his dreams came true. The spirit of the Polish people in 1791 has continued throughout these 165 years and many obstacles have been encountered and overcome, and will be overcome by the gallant Polish people. They shall rise again, as no nation as freedom loving and with the earnest devotion to the cause of liberty as they are, can be permanently enslaved.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join on this day with all those who mark May 3 as the day of the anniversary of Poland's Constitution. It is my hope that the world will pause to commemorate it, so that all those still enslaved in Poland's confines will hear the echo of the celebration, and will take hope therefrom.

The words embodied in Poland's Constitution echo the principles contained in the Magna Carta and the Declaration of Independence. The ideals of freedom and of individual liberty expressed are similar to ours. With such a heritage to remember, the disastrous plight of the Polish people living behind that impenetrable Iron Curtain, must be decried, and the hope instilled that the day will come when Poland will once again be a free nation.

With the recent changes of face that have marked the propaganda of the Soviet rulers, word has come that many thousands of political prisoners in Poland have been given their freedom. Perhaps through such an impulse, the will toward liberty will be strengthened in the Polish people.

May Poland's Constitution see a day of celebration in the land of its origin.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the remarks of our distinguished majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts. The world is today reminded of the occasion of Poland's Constitution Day. It is fitting that the Congress of the United States—the world's greatest symbol of freedom—should reflect upon the circumstances of enslavement which exist in other parts of the world.

It is well that we are reminded of the Soviet-Communist domination of the Polish people at a time when Soviet leadership is attempting to delude the free world into thinking that all is well behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Bulganin may smile and ask us to be friends, but they cannot hide the ruthless treatment of people and the relentless nature of their program. They have not released the Polish people from captivity, and they have not indicated that the new look on their faces reveals a new look at their motives. They have taken a new look at their policy of force and now believe they can achieve the same goals by fakery and deceit.

It behooves us to recognize Soviet deception and to say to the freedom-loving peoples everywhere that we will not be fooled by empty words. Debunking the Stalin legacy of oppression does not create moral integrity in his successors.

Now is the time to renew our pledge to resist Communist aggression in whatever form it appears. Today is the day to say to our Polish brethren we have not forgotten—and we will not forget.

It was fitting that the beautiful prayer in the House of Representatives today was delivered by the Reverend Valerian S. Karcz, of Hobart, Ind., in commemoration of Polish independence and the cause of freedom in the world.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a privilege to share in the commemoration of the 165th anniversary of the Polish Constitution—and in free Poland's national holiday. It is most fitting that we of the Congress of the United States grant due recognition to the historic date of May 3, 1791, the date of the birth of democratic constitutional government in Poland.

The bond between freedom-loving peoples is a strong one, Mr. Speaker, and the United States and Poland have long shared this common bond.

It is well for us to remember that as early as 1347, Poland established the first complete code of laws of Christian Europe. In 1413, Poland and Lithuania executed an agreement proclaiming for the first time in history the brotherhood of nations. In the year 1430 Poland's law—2½ centuries before England's *habeas corpus*—guaranteed security of the person, and recognized and safeguarded religious liberties.

The entire civilized world owes a great debt to the generations of loyal and devoted Polish people, for they have enriched western civilization beyond measure.

Today, we witness Poland's struggle against the chains of communism which, by subterfuge, duplicity, and subversion, have been cast upon her by the Soviet Union. In the name of justice and with the help of God, we must rededicate ourselves to the eventual liberation of the peoples of Poland from the yoke of tyranny. To this end, all free peoples must be unequivocally committed.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on this day, May 3, I take this opportunity to salute the people of Polish descent on the occasion of the 165th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791.

That famous document is one of Poland's great contributions to the development of the idea of human freedom. Not only is May 3, 1791, a memorable date in Poland's history, but it is also a landmark in the development of constitutional government. As such, the Polish Constitution is one of the outstanding documents of all times in the annals of human progress and democracy. It ranks with our own Declaration of Independence and with the Magna Carta. Poland was among the first nation to have a written democratic constitution seeking to establish and preserve the concept of liberty for the people.

Yet through the years that followed, Poland has experienced one invasion after another, tyranny and oppression, but the spirit of the Polish people remains indomitable in the face of all this suffering. The desire for human rights and justice, for freedom and religious

toleration, is stronger today than it has ever been in the history of mankind.

America, to which the citizens of Polish extraction have contributed so much toward its greatness, must continue to give hope and the fullest measure of moral and spiritual support in their hours of anguish over the fate that has befallen their ancestral land. Our sympathy and prayers go out to the people of Poland in their present tragic plight.

Unfortunately, the heroic Polish Nation is unable to speak for itself at this time. The Communist oppressor has stamped out every form of expression in Poland, except for blind loyalty to the slavemasters. Nevertheless, the will to resist the oppressor remains strong and the hope still lingers in the hearts of the people to become liberated at an early date.

We must do everything possible to strengthen that will on the part of the people in Poland and to encourage that hope in their hearts. On this anniversary, I extend my sincerest greetings and fondest hope that Poland will soon be liberated.

THE UNITED STATES HAS A MORAL OBLIGATION TO CONTINUE TO FIGHT FOR POLISH FREEDOM

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, on this Polish Constitution Day all Americans of every racial descent join with the people of Poland in a prayer for Polish independence and a renewed pledge to continue to work for the restoration of liberty and freedom to Poland and the rest of the enslaved Christian world.

No one who understands the great contribution to our own independence of the immortal Polish heroes of the Revolution or who has read of the glorious history of Poland in defense of Christian principles can help having tremendous admiration for the courage, patience, and fortitude of the Polish people in their current struggle to regain independence.

Heroic Poland gave us the best and most inspiring modern example of sacrifice for Christian principle in that terrible engagement with the Communists in 1920. The Polish people proved then to the world that they were among the very, very few who early recognized the planned and determined Kremlin objective of reducing the free world to pagan slavery. Would that we had wisely learned from their example and the recent years of too much appeasement and too often retreat, of developing world confusion and of increasing turmoil might well have been avoided.

The price the Polish people paid for their early courageous resistance to Communist attack was catastrophic and the blow was even more severe when it appeared that their supposed allies turned their backs upon and heads away from their cruel plight under Soviet subjugation and tyranny. The debt the free world owes to heroic Poland for her courageous struggle against the Communist horde 36 years ago still remains unpaid and will remain as a blot upon the moral integrity of this country and the United Nations until it is paid.

That is why we as Americans must never relax our efforts to help the Polish

people to reestablish their freedoms under their own chosen government. As a nation dedicated ourselves to the democratic principles of personal liberty and individual freedom, the United States Government has an obligation to unceasingly maintain the right of Poland to her independence and persevere, both as an individual nation and as a member of the United Nations, in demanding that the Communist leaders grant freedom and independence to Poland. We can do no less and still call ourselves a Christian democratic country while we join in prayer that the day will soon come when Poland, and all the other enslaved nations, will once again happily enjoy their personal and national freedom.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, the self-termed "collective leadership" of the Soviet Union have good reason to fear the date of May 3. The 3d day of May is the Polish Constitution Day, the day of unity of thought and action for all Poles worth of the Polish heritage of freedom.

Press dispatches on April 20 brought out that Poland's Communist regime had fired or demoted the Minister of State farms, the prosecutor general, and the chief military prosecutor general.

Press dispatches of April 21 announced the dismissal of the minister of justice and the downgrading of the minister of culture by Poland's Communist regime.

Press dispatches on April 22 pointed to the freeing of 30,000 Poles and the reduction of prison sentences to 70,000 others by Poland's Communist regime.

What is the meaning of this shift in command among Poland's servile Communist leaders?

In my opinion, Shakespeare best expressed the meaning of this readjustment when he wrote in *Macbeth*, "It is a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

Tools of the Stalin Communist faction in Poland have merely been replaced by tools of the Communist collective leadership faction. It is highly probable, also, that those who have been released from prison by the alleged amnesty are either Communists or true Poles, so broken in mind and body, that they are no longer considered a threat to their Communist oppressors.

Buried deep in the news dispatch of April 22 is the real cause of the feverish activity among Communists in Poland.

Reuters quotes the Communist Polish radio as saying:

Emigre criminals will be pardoned if they return to Poland before July 22, Polish National Day.

July 22 is the day the Communists of Poland want to impose on the Polish people as their day. It is no true Polish holiday.

May 3—Polish Constitution Day, the day Communists fear—is the day all true Poles honor.

The Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, was inspired by the awakened consciousness of human rights, the same awakening which led to the adoption of the French Declaration of Rights and the Constitution of the United States.

The May 3 constitution of Poland was adopted in an hour of utmost national

peril. Even as the men who formed it were deliberating, the absolute powers of Russia, Prussia, and Austria were preparing for the final partition of Poland. In spite of the success of absolutism over freedom, the May 3 constitution remained, with its lofty ideals of liberty and national and individual integrity, as a beacon for guidance—a living testament for future generations of Poles that it was their God-given right to be free.

After the rebirth of Poland in 1918, a new, a more modern constitution was enacted. Nevertheless, May 3—the day of the 1791 constitution—was proclaimed as the national holiday. It remained the national holiday throughout World War II. It was abolished as such only when the Communist regime gained complete control over Poland in 1945.

We of the United States have been aware that Poland has been under Communist domination since 1945. We are, also, aware that any attempts at active resistance by the unarmed Polish people would be instantly and brutally crushed by their Communist oppressors. But, we are also strongly aware that, although overt resistance is impractical, passive resistance continues with uninterrupted force.

The Catholic Church—free under the May 3 constitution—is a glowing lamp of liberty.

The Catholic Church and its adherents, representing 95 percent of the total present-day population of Poland—has always been identified with Polish patriotism and with Poland's unrelenting fight for independence.

What has been the Communist attitude toward the Catholic Church in Poland?

Communist propaganda maintains that there is freedom of religion in Poland.

The truth is that there have been frontal attacks against the Catholic Church by the Communists since 1945. Both Stalinist and collectivist Communist leaders have tried in vain to impose thought control in religious matters upon the Polish people. When they failed to sway the Polish people from their deep-rooted beliefs, they began to systematically persecute the church leaders. Cardinal Wyszynski was imprisoned. Prison gates clanged behind Bishop Adamski, and his brother bishops, Bieniek, Bednorz, Kaczmarek, Baraniak, and Bernacki. Hundreds of minor parish priests met the same fate. Still more hundreds were deprived of their right to carry out church duties.

What has been the end result of this planned campaign to paganize Poland?

Today, churches are overcrowded. There has been no material drop in the percentage of communicants in the Catholic Church in Poland. In fact, because the Communists oppose the Catholic Church, church attendance is one sure way for the true Pole to assert his anti-Communist feelings.

The May 3 constitution allowed free Polish to cross the boundaries of their nation at will.

In 1956, the Communist oppressors have to watch the frontiers. Guarding these frontiers are long stretches of

barbed wire, mine fields, police-dog patrols, searchlights, and thousands of soldiers. These warlike preparations are not designed to protect Poland from outsiders. Rather, they are created to prevent Poles from leaving their native land for the free West.

Have these police-state methods succeeded?

The answer is a resounding, "No." Notwithstanding these elaborate precautions, flights from Poland take place every day. Those who seek and find sanctuary in the free West represent every strata of Polish population. There are university professors among them. Government officials, soldiers, peasants, workers, and students daily risk their lives in the pursuit of liberty.

Polish seamen are specially eager to be free. The number who have run the Communist gantlet runs into hundreds, even thousands. Only a few weeks ago, a group of Americans of Polish ancestry financed and equipped a ship whose crew, for the most part, is composed of seamen who have jumped ship from vessels of the Communist Polish merchant marine.

This ship is named *Wolna Polska*—meaning free Poland.

The May 3 constitution firmly established the right of the Polish peasant to own land.

The Communist regime in Poland has tried to introduce the system of agriculture prevailing in the Soviet Union—to deprive the peasants of their land, to coerce them into joining collectives. The favored peasants who still keep their land must pay taxes approximating half of their income. In addition to this tax, the peasants are forced to turn over to their Communist oppressors staggering quotas of grain, milk, livestock, and potatoes. Quite recently, the Communists have admitted that peasants are often forced to buy grain on the free market in order to meet this compulsory quota. What is more, the peasants have to pay four times the official price for this free-market grain.

In spite of this fierce pressure, the Polish peasants still resist collectivism. So strong has been this resistance that the Communist regime has only succeeded in collectivizing 9 percent of the arable land.

The Polish peasant does not want to be a farmhand on a collective farm. He wants to be free to work his own land—his by right of inheritance, his by the letter and spirit of the May 3 constitution.

The May 3 constitution encouraged self-expression among Polish musicians, artists, and writers.

The Communist regime halted all intellectual progress. Art, and particularly literature, has been under strict supervision from the outset of the Communist occupation. It has been under the restriction of the principles of the so-called socialistic realism since 1949. This Communist doctrine orders all creative artists, in their productions, to carefully avoid showing the true picture of life as they see it. Instead, they are ordered to produce a distorted picture of life, designed solely for use by the Communists for propaganda purposes. Directly due to these restrictions during the 11 years

of Communist occupation, there has been a steady decline of original and worthwhile Polish art.

The creative artist had one choice to make. He had to choose between the Communist line and starving to death. Some abandoned their art entirely. Others created only to survive.

Resentment grew in the minds and hearts of these Polish creative artists. Finally, during the March 1956 meeting of the Art and Culture Council, which controls all art in Poland, this resentment came to a head. After a bitter debate, these artists surmounted their fear of reprisal by the Communist regime and condemned the unnatural principles of socialistic realism.

The creative artists of Poland had reverted to the freedom spelled out in the constitution of May 3, 1791.

The Communist oppressors of Poland well know the anti-Communist feeling of Polish peasants, workers, priests, and professional people.

As a result, they have falsified election results, outlawed free political parties, suppressed the opposition press, and denied the Polish people access to news of the outside world.

More than anything else, however, they have tried to stamp out the memory of the May 3 constitution. May 3 was, and is, the rallying point of all free Poles. They are even willing to bribe Poles who have fled their Communist oppressors with false liberty, provided they return by July 22. They hope that July 22 will erase May 3.

It never will.

The people of Poland cannot celebrate May 3 in the open in 1956.

Let us in the United States, we who are free, honor that day for them. Let us honor our own Constitution as we honor that of the people of Poland. Without our Constitution we could never have attained true freedom. With our Constitution, true freedom can never be lost.

Let us bow our heads and think of Poland on May 3.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Congress the fact that May 3, the occasion of Poland's Constitution Day, is a particularly fitting time to recall Poland's historic struggle to regain her lost freedom through generations of oppression and rule by conquerors. Today the changing atmosphere behind the Iron Curtain quickens the hearts of Poles everywhere in the hope that their beloved homeland may once again see freedom.

From the time Poland reached full-grown statehood in the 14th century ideas of democracy, freedom, religion, toleration, intellectual culture have been of first importance in that nation. These ideas are the traditions of the people rather than of the state. During the 19th century, when no Polish state existed, the nation nonetheless endured tenaciously, and, indeed, the people, lacking a state, clung all the more closely to their traditions. Not what the Polish state has been and has done but what the Polish people have been and still are—these are the components of that great tradition. It has been carried on by men and women, not by governmental bodies or

agencies. The achievements resulting from the tradition are personal, not official, and those persons who achieved much during former glorious centuries remain vivid in the memories of their descendants, state or no state. When Poland was restored in 1918 that tradition sprang at once into national and political effectiveness, as witness the turning back of the Bolshevik invasion.

During Poland's golden age, in the 16th century, much of the Polish tradition took shape. Time and again, far oftener than most of us today trouble to recall, the Poles were the eastern defenders of Christianity, order, and civilization itself. The eastern hordes of Tartars, Turks, and—in the 20th century—Bolsheviks were turned back by the valor and sacrifice of Poles whose bodies today lie in the soil fought over a hundred times.

Of few national traditions can Poles be more proud than that of tolerance—chiefly in the religious and political spheres, but also as a personal trait of the individual. In tolerant Poland of the middle ages the Jews found refuge from the persecutors who pursued them in other nations of Europe. In the 16th century, Poland was the only place that gave the Protestant revolution a just hearing. Jan Zamoyski, perhaps the greatest of all Poles, expressed this religious tolerance when he called together his friends who had left the Catholic Church; he would gladly give half his remaining life to see them return to the church, he said, but rather than see them return under compulsion he would lay down his life.

The Polish political tradition of non-aggression was clearly evidenced in the 15th and 16th centuries when Poland increased her territory threefold and her population twofold without intimidation, terror, or bloodshed. Her characteristic tolerance made other groups, the Lithuanians and Ruthenians, desire to join Poland.

The fate of Poland, the traditional friend of the United States, will always be of primary interest to Americans, if only in remembrance of the heroic work of Kosciuszko and Pulaski in helping the American colonies to win their independence.

Today, the Polish struggle for liberation is widespread. It is being waged on the national, social, cultural, and moral levels, where human mind and feeling often play a greater role than that of bayonet, prison, or concentration camp. The characteristics of national temperament of which I have spoken undoubtedly will help the Polish people endure the present Soviet occupation. The tradition of individualism constitutes an obstacle to the subordination of Poland to the Communist system which disregards the dignity and freedom of man.

We will never rest easily, never forget the Poles' justifiable and burning desire for freedom until the yoke of Soviet enslavement and brutality has been lifted. We look to the day when Poland will again emerge a strong, free, prosperous, and happy nation. We know the people will never give up their hope for the arrival of that day. With the help

of courage, perseverance, and faith in freedom, that day will come. I know.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, there are certain landmarks in the history of mankind's efforts toward a society of liberty under law which Americans can never forget. Just because Americans are drawn from the peoples of every part of the world, in a special way they find their inspiration in the history of those peoples.

On May 3 we mark the 165th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791. It is a sobering thought that for most of those 165 years the Polish people have not been their own masters, least of all today, when they must bear their enslavement by the Communist tyrants. Yet, the spirit of freedom has always burned fiercely in Polish hearts, and the constitution which they adopted on May 3, 1791, is a shining example of the embodiment of democratic principles.

No celebrations will be allowed in Poland today, but we in America can commemorate this day by reaffirming our own dedication to the fundamental precepts of the Polish Constitution of 1791 and by restating our determination that the Polish people shall once again be free.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I consider it an honor to participate in the celebration of the anniversary of Polish independence and to pay tribute to a heroic people. Today all people of Polish extraction greet this eventful date with a song on their lips, the Third of May Mazurka, and I am sure that even though the Iron Curtain alters the tones and distorts the words, the echo repeats from all sides: "Poland is not dead yet, while we are alive."

On May 3, 1791, Poland guaranteed freedom to all her citizens by adopting a constitution, and became the first nation in Europe to have a written democratic document proclaiming the principles of human liberty.

On September 1, 1939, Poland was the first nation to take up arms to resist Nazi aggression—the first who had the courage to say, "No" to Hitler. Poland in her international policy was faithful at all times, not only to the letter but also to the spirit of her treaties, and did not allow herself to be led astray by the Nazi proposal to take part in an attack on Soviet Russia, and refused to cooperate in any anti-Soviet plot, abiding by her neutrality and striving for peace. Yes; Poland was first to fight, and for this honor paid dearly with the blood of her soldiers, not only in Poland during the September campaign but on all Allied fronts—in Norway, France, in the Battle of Britain, Africa, Italy, Belgium, Normandy, Holland, Germany—on the seas, and in the skies over Europe.

Poland was the first ally. While Poland was the "mother of the United Nations," she was excluded from the Conference of the United Nations, convened on April 25, 1945, at San Francisco. Yet the thought that was to guide the work of the San Francisco Conference was expressed by a Polish king in 1750—Stanislaw Leszczynski, one of the early protagonists of international cooperation, who wrote a memorandum on

strengthening the general peace. The thought underlying his plan was that the community of nations should go to the assistance of any country attacked. Likewise, in 1833, Poland's greatest poet, Adam Mickiewicz, proclaimed in his works the ideal of the common brotherhood of man—a genuine international organization.

The Polish people have always been brave to the point of folly and they have always been believers in freedom. Time and again they have been found defending the rights of men and women to live their own lives in their own way. The Polish people fought against a German invader trying to steal other peoples' lands as far back as the year 963. In 1241 they saved Europe from the invading Tartar hordes. In 1685 it was Sobieski and the gallant Poles who protected and saved Christianity from the ravages of the Mohammedan sword and stopped the infidel hordes from overrunning Europe and destroying the Christian people. The liberty-loving Poles came to the aid of our American Colonies in the Revolutionary War. Wherever liberty and justice are at stake, the sons of Poland never fail to rally. Thousands of Polish boys from my State fought courageously on the battlefields of Korea.

Poland has always been devoted to the cause of humanity. Her contributions to human liberty and free institutions are glorious. She is a symbol of freedom and of peace.

In observing this anniversary of a great event in the history of Poland, let us recognize that the fate of this old, brave, great nation still disturbs the world and America. At Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam, we played a role not entirely compatible with our ideals. Let us all hope and pray that Poland, the first nation in Europe to adopt a democratic form of government, will be permitted to work out her own destiny under a government of her own, chosen by her own people.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was a warm and pleasant day in Warsaw on that May 3, 1791, when the Sejm—Parliament—was called to meet. Quite a few of the deputies were still vacationing on their private estates, scattered all over the country. Some citizens and the gentry who had gathered around the tables in Fukier's wine cellar, knew that something was brewing at the Sejm—what exactly, they did not know.

An old politician from out of town remarked, "The King is going to talk on some very important matter." He elaborated further, "that they will give equal rights to the peasants, commoners, and Jews."

Someone yelled from the back, "That will be the day." And deep in the corner lying under the table a nobleman reached for his sword declaring: "That will never happen, never, as long as I live."

It was close to 11 a. m. on that memorable morning. The tension of the crowd assembled in the Sejm seemed to mount. In the galleries, spectators were chattering, men and their ladies dressed in their finest outfits were looking at one another, trying to read each others

thoughts as to the big question: "Are you for, or against the new idea?"

What this great new and progressive idea was we will not repeat here. Year in and year out, we have hailed this great Polish Charter. It was equal to any other democratic legislature in existence in those days. We have mentioned its democratic character throughout, and I doubt that there is any need for repetition.

With the sound of the bell striking 11 o'clock at St. John's Church, King Stanislaw August Poniatowski, followed by a train of some 200 noblemen, officers of the guard, and royalty, entered the Sejm. Dressed in his favorite uniform of the cadet corps, he slowly proceeded toward the throne. Those opposed to the proposed program had threatened to take drastic measures in case a new order should be adopted. The chamberlain of the court and many a nobleman kept their hands ready on the hilt of their swords in case of disorder. The throne was protected by guards of the court and Ulan lancers. At the center door also, at the end of the assembly hall, stood the Sejm's marshal, and right behind him Prince Gen. Joseph Poniatowski and General Golgowski, guarding the exit against anyone who might try to get away after having caused the slightest disturbance. As the King ascended to the throne, the people in the galleries rose to their feet to get a glimpse of him. Some person yelled, "Long live the King," and the crowd in a spontaneous outburst began to hail their monarch. The opposition remained silent. Their facial expressions were hostile, as if judging a foe on the battlefield.

Malachowski, the president of the assembly, announced its opening by pounding his large cane three times against the floor, and the historical session began. To emphasize the gravity of the political situation, telegrams from Polish envoys abroad were first read. An outburst of the opposition was heard and some of them tried to leave the place but were forced back to their seats. When finally, after almost 7 hours of debating, someone rose to read the newly adopted constitution, a violent exchange of words began. At last they were interrupted by the King, who rose to his feet.

"The King behind his nation and the nation behind its King," could be heard from the galleries. Soon this phrase was picked up by the entire crowd, with the exception of a few hostile deputies. King Stanislaw August rose to his feet and solemnly swore to adhere to the constitution:

Juravi Domino, no me poenitebit—I swore to God and will not regret it—and now I call upon those who dearly love their fatherland to follow me into the church and there take an oath with me praying that God will let us succeed and see to it that we will achieve our great task.

While a great crowd with its king assembled in the church of St. John, some deputies of the opposition remained in the Sejm, arguing over their defeat, and the merits and disadvantages of the new charter. But there were not more than about 50 altogether against the 350 deputies assembled there before, they

calmly dispersed and went to their homes.

Mr. Speaker, today, 165 years after this great event, we once again bow our heads toward Poland, and its gallant nation. Although, in the last year alone some great political changes have taken place behind the Iron Curtain and the new anti-Stalin drive is in full swing, let us not be fooled by this treacherous new line. Many top-ranking Communists perished under Stalin's purges and others are now being rehabilitated and vindicated. Not one shadow of doubt remains in my mind, that this is a new trick and diversion directed at the western powers. It is a new policy of smoke-screen, largely written up in our press. But who are the people leading this new policy? Are they newcomers? All of them were the closest collaborators of that tyrant, Stalin. Without them, one man could never have succeeded in wiping out entire populations, jailing others, humiliating and disgracing them. Bulganin, Khrushchev, Malenkov, Zuckov, Rokossovski, and so forth, are not new names to us. They have come up ever since Stalin's became known here. And how about their protectors? General Serov, of the infamous MVD, the mass murderer of the Baltic Nations? I hope that this time we shall not repeat mistakes of the past, and will not be fooled by the "angels of Russia's new regime." The only way we will be able to save other thousands of human beings behind the Iron Curtain from further unwarranted cruelty and punishment, is to follow the spirit of the May 3 constitution, to preserve the liberty, and integrity of the Polish people.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy on the occasion of the 165th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution to join in tribute to the people of Poland and the indomitable spirit which they have shown throughout the centuries.

No one can turn the pages of history without realizing the brilliant contribution which the Polish people have made to mankind in the field of literature, in the field of music, in the field of science, in the military and other fields.

No one could travel throughout Poland, meeting some of its outstanding leaders, as it has been my privilege to do in days gone by, without sensing the genius of the people.

We in America are fortunate in having some 6 million fellow citizens of Polish descent. They have contributed greatly to the life of the Nation in time of peace and in time of war, and are today playing their part in the struggle in which we are engaged for freedom and independence in a peaceful world.

America and Poland have had much in common in their love of liberty, justice, and peace and have evidenced their friendship in experience shared, and in mutual assistance rendered in time of need.

During the Revolutionary War, it was General Kosciuszko and General Pulaski who came to the assistance of America.

During and after the First World War, our national leaders contributed greatly to the rebirth and rebuilding of Poland.

During the Second World War, the soldiers of Poland fought brilliantly in many theaters of the war. They fought on land, they fought in the air, their aviators winning especial renown. They fought on despite unbelievable suffering inflicted upon those at home.

We all appreciate the unbelievable suffering which those in the homeland have experienced under the yoke of Communist aggression.

We are confident, however, that the spirit of Poland which proved indomitable despite 150 years of partition by the forces of three empires will again prove indomitable despite the circumstances by which Poland is today confronted.

We look forward to the day when the ideals and courage of the Polish people will be rewarded by a government which is again independent, playing its proper role among the free nations of the world.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, which is the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of 1791, I would like—since that heroic nation is unable to speak for itself—to commemorate for its people this significant occasion marking the former freedom and democratic practices of that nation; and also to express the hope felt by myself and millions of others in our own free land and that the future will bring to the Poles behind the Iron Curtain a release from their present bondage and an opportunity once more to function as free men in true national freedom. Not only is this the hope of individual Americans and of Americans like ourselves who represent the people of the United States in the Congress: The State Department, in a statement issued yesterday, pointed out that in recent years May 3 has become something more than the day Poles and their friends celebrate as Poland's National Day. "It has become a day on which the United States reaffirms its assurances that it is not reconciled to the bondage of Poland."

We look forward with the Polish people to the day when they can again celebrate this great occasion as a free nation.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on May 3 the free people of the world pay homage to Polish Constitution Day, which the Poles themselves are prevented from observing because of the Communist conspiracy that presently dominates their land. Since the current tactical maneuvers of the Soviet Union are leading people to expect some changes in its policies toward the satellite countries, it would be well to examine the situation with reference to Poland.

The Polish Constitution was brought into force on May 3, 1791—just 2 years after our own, and was inspired by the same faith in freedom. Shortly thereafter Poland was again occupied by a foreign aggressor and remained occupied until 1918. The freedom after World War I was short-lived because the conspiracy of Hitler and Stalin showed its first fruits in the brutal partition of Poland. Stalin—and now his heirs—have prevented Poland from regaining its freedom until today.

But what of Soviet Russia's new tactics—their talk of reducing tensions and of peaceful coexistence? There are some palace revolutions occurring in Poland these days which follow the pattern of Moscow itself in removing those Communists of the Stalin cult. These changes, rather than giving the people their rights, are merely shifting the rank of certain Communists.

When Boleslaw Bierut, chairman of the Polish Communist Central Committee, died recently, the world wondered who would succeed him as the top Polish Communist. His successor was Edward Ochab, whose previous record forecasts little change for the better.

But throughout the Communist domination the gallant Poles have never lost hope of eventually realizing their legitimate ambitions for independence and the right to form a government in accord with the popular will of the people. All the information we have confirms the fact that the Poles are as bitterly opposed to communism as they were to any foreign domination.

These people must not be allowed to lose hope. They must feel certain that we who still hold freedom dear have not forgotten them. They need such reassurance that we are giving in the Congress today. And you may feel certain that our words and sentiments circulate rapidly through the Polish nation.

While being cautious of the Soviet Union's new tactics, we can still utilize them. Let us repeat over and over again that we are awaiting some positive results of their propaganda words. Let us encourage the enslaved peoples to maintain their pressures on their Soviet rulers. Eventually the irresistible forces that topple all tyrants must sweep the Communist conspiracy out of every corner of the earth.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, friends of Poland celebrate the 165th anniversary of an instrument that marked a milestone in the history of a brave people—the Polish Constitution of 1791. The constitution was an attempt to do away with an outmoded government and replace it with a modern parliamentary system. By instituting drastic reforms it afforded the possibility of sound, progressive national life. In the light of the years which have followed it can be considered one of the greatest achievements in Polish history.

But in celebrating Polish Constitution Day in 1956 the true friends of Poland do not dwell overlong on the victories of the past—they examine the present and look toward the future.

The present times are indeed times of trouble. Poland today has been made the satellite of an ancient enemy, Soviet Russia. It has been subjected to ruthless, thorough, relentless sovietization. It has been flooded with Soviet propaganda, its press forced to reproduce Soviet articles, its moving-picture theaters to exhibit Soviet pictures. Soviet specialists and technicians swarm over Poland. The Polish economy has been twisted and bent to meet Soviet needs. Soviet officials occupy key positions in the army, in the secret police, and in the administration.

The teaching of religion has been suppressed, in line with Communist philosophy. Hundreds of the adherents of religious orders have been thrown into prison. The Catholic Church has been completely subordinated to the sovietized Polish Government. The children of Poland are being taught to turn their backs on the God of their fathers. They are being made to forget the ancient cultural traditions which have been the glory of their homeland.

But though the present may be dark, the future is not without hope. The year 1956 may, indeed, bring new opportunities for greater freedom undreamed of a short time ago. The latest revelations of the Stalin reign of terror in the U. S. S. R. have turned the spotlight on a fundamental weakness in any regime based on forced labor, oppression, and murder: the dictators' haunting fear of being liquidated, just as they themselves have liquidated others.

Nothing should instill more hope in the hearts of an oppressed people than the knowledge that their slave masters are divided amongst themselves. In the words of an old saying "When knaves fall out, true men come to their own."

The heartfelt wish of the American people, and of their representatives in Congress, is that the day may not be far distant when the true, freedom-loving people of Poland "come to their own."

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is the 165th anniversary of the adoption by the people of Poland of their Constitution of May 3, 1791. That constitution, following so closely upon ours of the United States of America, was a triumph of democratic principles which has remained as a guiding light through all the hard, harsh years of Poland's oppression.

Today, as for most of the time that followed the adoption of her constitution, Poland writhes in the grip of aggressive tyranny. The country is a prisoner, but the minds and hearts of the men and women of Poland remain free. The magnificent ideals of the constitution of May 3, 1791, are firmly held and proudly believed. The day will surely come when Poland shall again stand forth as the land of freedom, peace, and prosperity.

On this anniversary I proudly join in honoring and saluting a courageous people, a country magnificent even in oppression, and a document that ranks with the world's finest expositions of the principles of human liberty and dignity.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the noble people of Poland on this historical occasion—the 165th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791.

This constitution was greeted by the people of Poland with open arms, for its adoption brought with it tolerance, equality, and justice. The constitution of May 3, 1791, was truly a sincere effort on the part of Polish statesmen to better the existing conditions of the people by establishing a constitutional democracy. This document represented the will of the people and although it is not the law

of the land in Poland today, it will never be forgotten.

In World War II, Poland, despite her unpreparedness, struck back at the overwhelming forces of the Nazis with great courage. After their nation was occupied, the Polish people attempted to do all they could to fight for the cause of freedom and the dignity of man. Polish forces were organized outside their homeland, and they fought in battles in France, Italy, Belgium, and Africa.

World War II ended over a decade ago, and the first nation to stand up to the aggressor in the global conflict still remains under the chains of slavery. I am reminded of the statement once made by Lincoln, "Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves." Poland and her noble people live under a regime that completely ignores the rights and the dignity of man. The conditions under which the Poles live today are appalling and incompatible with the principles of freedom and democracy.

Poland's hour of darkness has been a tragically long one, and today, more than ever, her people need a word of encouragement and of inspiration, to fortify them in their continuous struggle for freedom. On this auspicious occasion, we have the opportunity to tell the Polish people and others who have been enslaved, that we are not resigned to their present fate. We are confident that Poland is not lost forever and that she will again achieve her rightful position among the free nations, to contribute her efforts in the cause of peace and security.

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend the Western Hemisphere provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. This is a companion bill to S. 3672, introduced by Senators CAPEHART and FREAR. The purpose of this bill is to permit small business to be on an equal competitive basis with big business in the markets in the Western Hemisphere. On February 26, 1954, the Ways and Means Committee adopted unanimously a motion I made that the Treasury Department undertake a study of the taxation of Western Hemisphere trading corporations so as to eliminate the discrimination between the large and small countries conducting business in the Western Hemisphere.

In the Ways and Means Committee report on the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the Western Hemisphere trade corporation, section 921, it is stated:

Although your committee believes that the present Western Hemisphere trade corporation provisions produce some anomalous results, it has retained those provisions in order to avoid any disturbance at the present

time to established channels of trade. (H. Rept. No. 1337, 83d Cong., 2d sess., pp. 77, 78.)

The reason for this language in the committee report was based upon the testimony of the State Department officials who expressed concern that our South and Central American friends would misinterpret any amendment to the Western Hemisphere trading act, particularly as a conference of the Western Hemisphere countries was about to take place in Caracas, Venezuela. The only reason the Ways and Means Committee did not actually adopt an amendment to the Western Hemisphere provisions was to avoid any misunderstanding.

After the Caracas convention, it was reported that an informal understanding was reached with the other countries in the Western Hemisphere in regard to possible amendment of the Western Hemisphere trading act to eliminate these discrepancies and it was reported that these countries would have no objection to such amendments. It is my understanding that the Senate Finance Committee was prepared to go ahead to amend the Western Hemisphere provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 along these lines but that a dispute arose over the drafting of the technical language to be used to accomplish the purpose. Since that date there have been many attempts made to provide proper language to eliminate these discrepancies against the smaller companies. The language of the bill I have introduced, which is a companion to S. 3672, appears to be language which will accomplish this objective. This matter has remained dormant all too long and I am very hopeful that this bill will be enacted into law.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Monday next for the Private Calendar to be called.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 38]

Ashley	Grant	Miller, Calif.
Barden	Gregory	Mollohan
Blitch	Griffiths	Morrison
Bowler	Gubser	Nelson
Boykin	Haley	Norblad
Broyhill	Hayworth	O'Hara, Minn.
Burdick	Hoffman, Ill.	Passman
Byrd	Jenkins	Prouty
Carlyle	Johnson, Calif.	Rains
Chatham	Kearns	Simpson, Pa.
Cole	Lane	Staggers
Diggs	Lankford	Taylor
Donovan	McDowell	Utt
Eberharter	Matthews	Williams, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and ninety-three Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2104), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH reserved all points of order on the bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 258):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, late a Senator from the State of Kentucky and a former Vice President of the United States.

Resolved, That a committee be appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall be a member of the committee, to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator at Paducah, Ky.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader if he can inform the House as to the program for the rest of this week and next week.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The program for this week will be completion of the bill now pending before the House. When that is completed today I shall ask unanimous consent that the House adjourn over until Monday. That will complete the legislative program for the present week.

On Monday the Consent Calendar will be called. There are no suspensions. After call of the Consent Calendar, bills on the Private Calendar will be called, after which the following bills will be called up for consideration:

S. 2972, a bill out of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in relation to damage and destruction of aircraft.

House Joint Resolution 501, authorizing participation in the NATO Conference on a parliamentary level.

There are primaries on Monday in Maryland so that if there are any rollcalls demanded the rollcalls will go over until Wednesday.

On Tuesday the following bills will be considered:

H. R. 2840, the library bill for rural areas.

H. R. 8901, to create and establish a District of Columbia transportation system.

There are primaries in five States on Tuesday, so that any rollcalls on that day will go over until Wednesday. In other words, any rollcalls demanded on Monday and Tuesday because of primaries will go over until Wednesday.

On Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday if necessary, the Defense Department appropriation bill for 1957 will be called up and considered.

There are the usual reservations that any further program will be announced later and conference reports may be brought up at any time.

1956 FARM BILL

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 10875) to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10875, with Mr. PRIEST in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read section 101 of the bill. If there are no amendments to that section the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—SOIL BANK ACT

Short title

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Soil Bank Act."

Declaration of Policy

SEC. 102. The Congress hereby finds that the production of excessive supplies of agricultural commodities depresses the prices and income of farm families; constitutes improper land use and brings about soil erosion, depletion of soil fertility, and too rapid release of water from lands where it falls, thereby adversely affecting the national welfare, impairing the productive facilities necessary for a continuous and stable supply of agricultural commodities, and endangering an adequate supply of water for agricultural and nonagricultural use; overtaxes the facilities of interstate and foreign transportation; congests terminal markets and handling and processing centers in the flow of commodities from producers to consumers; depresses prices in interstate and foreign commerce; disrupts the orderly marketing of commodities in such commerce; and otherwise affects, burdens, and obstructs interstate and foreign commerce. It is in the interest of the general welfare that the soil and water resources of the Nation be not wasted and depleted in the production of such burdensome surpluses and that interstate and foreign commerce in agricultural commodities be protected from excessive supplies. It is

hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress and the purposes of this title to protect and increase farm income, to protect the national soil, water, and forest and wildlife resources from waste and depletion, to protect interstate and foreign commerce from the burdens and obstructions which result from the utilization of farmland for the production of excessive supplies of agricultural commodities, and to provide for the conservation of such resources and an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of such agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce. To effectuate the policy of Congress and the purposes of this title programs are herein authorized to assist farmers to divert a portion of their cropland from the production of excessive supplies of agricultural commodities, and to carry out a program of soil, water, forest, and wildlife conservation. The activities authorized under this title are supplementary to the acreage allotments and marketing quotas authorized under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and together with such acreage allotments and marketing quotas, constitute an overall program to prevent excessive supplies of agricultural commodities from burdening and obstructing interstate and foreign commerce.

Substitute A—Acreage reserve program Terms and Conditions

Sec. 103. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to formulate and carry out an acreage reserve program for the 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959 crops of wheat, cotton, corn produced in the commercial corn-producing area, other feed grains (corn produced outside the commercial corn-producing area, grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats), peanuts, rice, flue-cured tobacco, burley tobacco, Maryland tobacco, dark air-cured tobacco, fire-cured tobacco, Virginia sun-cured tobacco, cigar binder tobacco types 51, 52, 54, and 55, and Ohio cigar filler tobacco types 42, 43, and 44, respectively (hereinafter referred to as "the commodity"), under which producers shall be compensated for reducing their acreages of the commodity below their farm acreage allotments or their farm base acreages, whichever may be applicable. To be eligible for such compensation the producer (1) shall reduce his acreage of the commodity below his farm acreage allotment or farm base acreage, whichever may be applicable within such limits as the Secretary may prescribe, (2) shall specifically designate the acreage so withdrawn from the production of such commodity (hereinafter referred to as the "reserve acreage"), and (3) shall not harvest any crop from, or graze, the reserve acreage unless the Secretary, after certification by the Governor of the State in which such acreage is situated of the need for grazing on such acreage, determines that it is necessary to permit grazing thereon in order to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster, and consents to such grazing. Reserve acreage of a commodity may include acreage whether or not planted to the production of the 1956 crop of the commodity prior to the announcement of the acreage reserve program for the 1956 crop if the crop thereon, if any, shall be plowed under or otherwise physically incorporated into the soil, or clipped, mowed, or cut to prevent maturing so that the reduction in acreage of the commodity below the acreage allotment occurs within 21 days after the enactment of this title, or by such later date as may be fixed by the Secretary. The reserve acreage shall be in addition to any acreage devoted to the conservation reserve program authorized under subtitle B of this title. The acreage reserve program may include such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically provided for herein, in-

cluding provisions relating to control of noxious weeds on the reserve acreage, as the Secretary determines are desirable to effectuate the purposes of this title and to facilitate the practical administration of the acreage reserve program.

Before any producer is entitled to receive any compensation for participating in the acreage reserve program, he must first enter into a contract with the Secretary, which contract, in addition to such other terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary, shall contain provisions by which such producer shall agree:

(1) In the event that the Secretary determines that there has been a violation of the contract at any stage during the time such producer has control of the farm and that such violation is of such a substantial nature as to warrant termination of the contract, to forfeit all rights to payments or grants under the contract, and to refund to the United States all payments and grants received by him thereunder.

(2) In the event that the Secretary determines that there has been a violation of the contract but that such violation is of such a nature as not to warrant termination of the contract, to accept such payment adjustments, forfeit such benefits, and make such refunds to the United States of payments and benefits received by him, under the contract as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate.

(b) (1) There is hereby established for each year for which an acreage reserve program is in effect for corn a total base acreage of corn for the commercial corn-producing area proclaimed under section 327 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, of 51 million acres. The total base acreage of corn for the commercial corn-producing area shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the counties in such area on the basis of the acreage of corn in such counties during the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the apportionment is made (plus, in applicable years, the acreage diverted under previous agricultural adjustment, conservation, and soil-bank programs), with adjustments for abnormal weather conditions, for trends in acreage during such period, and for the promotion of soil-conservation practices: *Provided*, That any downward adjustment for the promotion of soil-conservation practices shall not exceed 2 percent of the total base acreage that would otherwise be apportioned to the county. The base acreage for the county shall be apportioned by the Secretary, through the local committees, among the farms within the county on the basis of past acreage of corn (planted and diverted), tillable acreage crop-rotation practices, types of soil, and topography.

(2) This subsection (b) shall become inoperative after 1956 if in the referendum conducted pursuant to section 308 (b), producers do not vote in favor of the program provided in subsection (c) of such section.

(c) For each year in which an acreage reserve program will be in effect for corn, a farm base acreage shall be established for feed grains. For 1956, in the commercial corn-producing area, such farm base acreage for feed grains shall be the average acreage on the farm planted to grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats, for the 3 years 1953, 1954, and 1955; and outside the commercial corn-producing area, such farm base acreage for feed grains shall be the average acreage on the farm planted to grain sorghums, barley, rye, oats, and corn, for the 3 years 1953, 1954, and 1955. For 1957 and subsequent years in which an acreage reserve program will be in effect for corn, there is hereby established a total base acreage for feed grain (corn produced outside the commercial corn-producing area, grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats). Such total base acreage for feed grains shall be the

average acreage planted to such feed grains for the 3 years 1953, 1954, and 1955, adjusted to reflect any change in the commercial corn-producing area. The total base acreage of feed grains shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the States on the basis of the acreage of feed grains (planted and diverted) in such States for the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the apportionment is made, with adjustments for abnormal weather conditions and for trends in acreage during such period. The base acreage of feed grains for each State, less a reserve of not to exceed 3 percent thereof for apportionment as provided by this subsection, shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the counties on the basis of the acreage of feed grains (planted and diverted) in such counties for the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the apportionment is made, with adjustments for abnormal weather conditions, for trends in acreage during such period, and for the promotion of soil-conservation practices: *Provided*, That any downward adjustment for the promotion of soil-conservation practices shall not exceed 2 percent of the total base acreage that would otherwise be apportioned to the county. The base acreage for the county shall be apportioned by the Secretary, through the local committees, among the farms within the county on the basis of past acreage of feed grains (planted and diverted), tillable acreage, crop-rotation practices, type of soil, and topography. The reserve set aside herein shall be apportioned to farms on which feed grains have not been planted for any of the crops for the 3 years immediately preceding the year for which the apportionment is made (such farms are hereinafter called new feed grain farms). Producers shall not be eligible for compensation under the acreage reserve program for feed grains on new feed-grain farms. For purposes of this subsection, section 114, and section 308 (d) the terms "plant" or "planted," as used with respect to feed grains, other than corn, shall mean plant or planted for harvest as grain.

Extent of Participation in Program

Sec. 104. For purposes of the acreage-reserve program the Secretary shall establish a national reserve acreage goal for the 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959 crops of each commodity specified in section 103 (a). The limits within which individual farms may participate in the acreage reserve program shall be established in such manner as the Secretary determines is reasonably calculated to achieve the national reserve acreage goal and give producers a fair and equitable opportunity to participate in the acreage reserve program, taking into consideration their acreage allotments or farm base acreages, whichever may be applicable, the supply and demand conditions for different classes, grades, and qualities of the commodity, and such other factors as he deems appropriate.

Compensation of producers

Sec. 105. (a) Producers shall be compensated for participating in the acreage reserve program through the issuance of negotiable certificates which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary (1) in cash upon presentation by the producer or by any holder in due course or (2) at the option of the producer in the case of certificates issued with respect to grains and upon presentation by him, in grains (such grains to be valued by the Secretary at such levels as he determines will not materially impair the market price for such grain yet will, to the maximum extent practicable encourage acceptance of payment in grains in lieu of cash): *Provided*, That disposition of quantities of stocks hereunder in any 1 year shall be limited to not more than two-thirds of such quantities of such commodities as the Secretary determines would be a rea-

sonable estimate of what would have been produced for marketing during such marketing year on the acreage withheld from production under the provisions of this title: *And provided further*, That such stocks shall not be released prior to the end of the normal harvesting season for the particular commodity being released. Compensation under this section shall be at such rate or rates as the Secretary determines will provide producers with a fair and reasonable return for reducing their acreage of the commodity, taking into consideration the loss of production of the commodity on the reserve acreage, any savings in cost which result from not planting the commodity on the reserve acreage, and the incentive necessary to achieve the reserve acreage goal. The Secretary shall make an adjustment in yields for drought, flood, or other abnormal conditions in estimating the loss of production for purposes of establishing rates of compensation. The rates of payment offered under this section shall be such as to encourage producers to underplant their allotments more than 1 year. Commodities delivered to producers in redemption of such certificates shall not be eligible for tender to Commodity Credit Corporation under the price support program.

(b) No compensation shall be paid to any producer for participating in the acreage reserve program for any year until the Secretary has ascertained that such producer has complied with the acreage reduction requirements of such program for such year.

(c) The total compensation paid producers for participating in the acreage reserve program with respect to any year's crops shall not exceed \$750 million, and with respect to any commodity for any year shall not exceed the amount shown below: Wheat, \$375 million; cotton, \$300 million; corn in the commercial corn-producing area, \$300 million; other feed grains, \$175 million; peanuts, \$7 million; rice \$23 million; and tobacco, \$45 million. The total amount available for the acreage reserve program for any year's crops shall be apportioned among the various commodities on the basis of the amounts required to achieve the reserve acreage goal for each commodity established under section 104.

Effect on Acreage Allotments and Quotas

Sec. 106. (a) In the future establishment of State, county, and farm acreage, allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or base acreages under this title, reserve acreages applicable to any commodity shall be credited to the State, county, and farm as though such acreage had actually been devoted to the production of the commodity.

(b) In applying the provisions of paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, 77th Congress (7 U. S. C. 1340 (6)), and sections 326 (b) and 356 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1326 (b), 1356 (g)), relating to reduction of the storage amounts of wheat and rice, the reserve acreage of the commodity on any farm shall be regarded as wheat acreage or rice acreage, as the case may be, on the farm.

Subtitle B—Conservation reserve program

Terms and Conditions

Sec. 107. (a) To effectuate the purposes of this title the Secretary is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for periods of not less than 3 years with producers determined by him to have control for the contract period of the farms covered by the contract wherein the producer shall agree:

(1) To establish and maintain for the contract period protective vegetative cover (including but not limited to grass and trees), water-storage facilities, or other soil-, water-, wildlife-, or forest-conserving uses on a specifically designated acreage of land on the farm regularly used in the production of crops (including crops, such as tame hay,

alfalfa, and clovers, which do not require annual tillage).

(2) To devote to conserving crops or uses, or allow to remain idle, throughout the contract period an acreage of the remaining land on the farm which is not less than the acreage normally devoted only to conserving crops or uses or normally allowed to remain idle on such remaining acreage.

(3) Not to harvest any crop from the acreage established in protective vegetative cover, excepting timber (in accordance with sound forestry management) and wildlife or other natural products of such acreage which do not increase supplies of feed for domestic animals.

(4) Not to graze any acreage established in protective vegetative cover prior to January 1, 1959, or such later date as may be provided in the contract, except pursuant to the provisions of section 103 (a) (3) hereof; and if such acreage is grazed at the end of such period, to graze such acreage during the remainder of the period covered by the contract in accordance with sound pasture management.

(5) Not to adopt any practice, or divert lands on the farm from conservation, woods, grazing, or other use, to any use specified by the Secretary in the contract as a practice or use which would tend to defeat the purposes of the contract.

(6) (A) In the event that the Secretary determines that there has been a violation of the contract at any stage during the time such producer has control of the farm and that such violation is of such a substantial nature as to warrant termination of the contract, to forfeit all rights to payments or grants under the contract, and to refund to the United States all payments and grants received by him thereunder.

(B) In the event that the Secretary determines that there has been a violation of the contract but that such violation is of such a nature as not to warrant termination of the contract, to accept such payment adjustments, forfeit such benefits, and make such refunds to the United States of payments and benefits received by him, under the contract, as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate.

(7) To such additional provisions as the Secretary determines are desirable and includes in the contract to effectuate the purposes of this title and to facilitate the practical administration of the conservation reserve program, including provisions relating to control of noxious weeds.

(b) In return for such agreement by the producer the Secretary shall agree:

(1) To bear such part of the cost (including labor) of establishing and maintaining vegetative cover or water-storage facilities, or other soil-, water-, wildlife-, or forest-conserving uses, on the designated acreage as the Secretary determines to be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this title, but not to exceed a maximum amount per acre or facility prescribed by the Secretary for the county or area in which the farm is situated; and

(2) To make an annual payment to the producer for the term of the contract upon determination that he has fulfilled the provisions of the contract entitling him to such payment. The rate or rates of the annual payment to be provided for in the contracts shall be established on such basis as the Secretary determines will provide producers with a fair and reasonable annual return on the land established in protective vegetative cover or water storage facilities, or other soil-, water-, wildlife-, or forest-conserving uses, taking into consideration the value of the land for the production of commodities customarily grown on such kind of land in the county or area, the prevailing rates for cash rentals for similar land in the county or area, the incentive necessary to obtain contracts covering sufficient acreage for the substantial accomplishment of the purposes

of the conservation-reserve program, and such other factors as he deems appropriate. Such rate or rates may be determined on an individual farm basis, a county or area basis, or such other basis as the Secretary determines will facilitate the practical administration of the program.

(c) In determining the lands in any area to be covered by contracts entered into under this section, the Secretary may use advertising and bid procedure if he determines that such action will contribute to the effective and equitable administration of the conservation-reserve program.

(d) A contract shall not be terminated under paragraph (6) of subsection (a) unless the nature of the violation is such as to defeat or substantially impair the purposes of the contract. Whenever the State committee believes that there has been a violation which would warrant termination of a contract, the producer shall be given written notice thereof by registered mail or personal service, and the producer shall, if he requests such an opportunity within 30 days after the delivery or service of such notice, be given an opportunity to show cause, in an informal proceeding before the county committee under regulations promulgated by the Secretary, why the contract should not be terminated. If the producer does not request an opportunity to show cause why the contract should not be terminated within such 30-day period, the determination of the State committee made in accordance with regulations of the Secretary shall be final and conclusive. If the producer within such 30-day period requests an opportunity to show cause why the contract should not be terminated, the county committee, at the conclusion of the proceedings, shall submit a report, including its recommendations, to the State committee for a determination, on the basis of such report and such other information as is available to the State committee, as to whether there has been a violation which would warrant termination of the contract. The producer shall be accorded the right, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary, to appear before the State committee in connection with the State committee's determination of the issue. The producer shall be given written notice by registered mail or personal service of the State committee's determination. If the producer feels aggrieved by such determination, he may obtain judicial review of such determination by filing a complaint with the United States district court for the district in which the land covered by the contract is located, within 90 days after the delivery or service of notice of such determination, requesting the court to set aside such determination. Service of process in such action shall be made in accordance with the rule for service of process upon the United States prescribed by the Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States District Courts. The copy of the summons and complaint required to be delivered to the officer or agency whose order is being attacked shall be sent to the chairman of the State committee. The action in the United States district court shall be a trial de novo to determine whether there has been a violation which would warrant termination of the contract. If the producer does not seek judicial review of the State committee's determination within the 90-day period allowed therefor, the State committee's determination shall be final and conclusive. The terms "county committee" and "State committee" as used herein refer to the county and State committees established under section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

Conservation Reserve Goal

SEC. 108. (a) The Secretary shall not later than February 1 of each year determine and announce the national conservation reserve goal for such year. Such goal shall be that

percentage which the Secretary determines it is practicable to cover by contracts during such year of the number of acres, if any, by which (1) the acreage used for the production of agricultural commodities during the year preceding the year for which such determination is made, plus any acreage then in the acreage or conservation reserve program or retired from production as a result of acreage allotments or marketing quotas, exceeds (2) the acreage needed during the year for which such determination is made for the production of agricultural commodities for domestic consumption and export and an adequate allowance for carryover. As soon as practicable after the enactment of this title the Secretary shall determine the national conservation acreage goal for 1956.

(b) In distributing the national acreage goal among the various States and major crop production regions, the Secretary shall give due regard to the respective needs of the various States and regions for flood control, drought control, and other conservation benefits; the desires of producers in particular States or regions to participate in the conservation program; the diversion of acreage from crops under acreage allotments or marketing quotas; and the need to assure adequate production of agricultural commodities and products not in surplus and to discourage the production of agricultural commodities and products in surplus.

(c) The Secretary shall transmit to the Congress on or before March 15 of each year a report of the scope of the conservation reserve program for the preceding year and the basis for participation in such program in the various States and major crop-production regions of the country.

Authorized Period of Contracts and Expenditures

SEC. 109. (a) The Secretary is authorized to formulate and announce programs under this subtitle B and to enter into contracts thereunder with producers during the 5-year period 1956-1960 to be carried out during the period ending not later than December 31, 1969, except that contracts for the establishment of tree cover may continue until December 31, 1974.

(b) The period covered by any contract shall not exceed 10 years, except that contracts for the establishment of tree cover may extend for 15 years.

(c) In carrying out the conservation reserve program, the Secretary shall not enter into contracts with producers which would require payments to producers, including the cost of materials and services, in excess of \$450 million in any calendar year.

Termination and Modification of Contracts

SEC. 110. (a) The Secretary may terminate any contract with a producer by mutual agreement with the producer if the Secretary determines that such termination would be in the public interest.

(b) The Secretary may agree to such modification of contracts previously entered into as he may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of this title and to facilitate the practical administration of the conservation reserve program.

Conservation Materials and Services

SEC. 111. (a) The Secretary may purchase or produce conservation materials and services and make such materials and services available to producers under the conservation reserve program to aid them in establishing vegetative-cover or water-storage facilities, or other soil-, water-, wildlife-, or forest-conserving uses, under contracts authorized by this subtitle B, may reimburse any Federal, State, or local Government agency for conservation materials and services furnished by such agency, and may pay expenses necessary in making such materials, and services available, including all or part of the costs incident to the delivery, appli-

cation, or installation of materials and services.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in making conservation materials and services available to producers hereunder, the Secretary may make payments, in advance of determination of performance by the producers, to persons who fill purchase orders covering approved conservation materials or who render services to the Secretary in furnishing to producers approved conservation materials or services for the establishment by the producers of vegetative cover or water storage facilities, or other soil-, water-, wildlife-, or forest-conserving uses, under contracts authorized by this subtitle B. The price at which purchase orders for any conservation material or service are filled may be limited, if the Secretary determines that it is necessary in the interest of producers and the Government, to a fair price fixed in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

Effect on Other Programs

Sec. 112. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) insofar as the acreage of cropland on any farm enters into the determination of acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the cropland acreage on the farm shall not be deemed to be decreased during the period of any contract entered into under the conservation reserve program by reason of the establishment and maintenance of vegetative cover or water storage facilities, or other soil-, water-, wildlife-, or forest-conserving uses, under such contract; and

(2) the acreage on any farm which is determined under regulations of the Secretary to have been diverted from the production of any commodity in order to carry out the contract entered into under the conservation reserve program shall be considered acreage devoted to the commodity for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and base acreages under this act.

Geographical Applicability

Sec. 113. This subtitle B shall apply to the continental United States, and, if the Secretary determines it to be in the national interest, to one or more of the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and as used in this subtitle B, the term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Subtitle C—General provisions

Compliance With Acreage Allotments

Sec. 114. No person shall be eligible for payments or compensation under this title with respect to any farm for any year in which (1) the acreage of any basic agricultural commodity other than wheat or corn on the farm exceeds the farm acreage allotment for the commodity under title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or (2) the wheat acreage on the farm exceeds the larger of the farm wheat acreage allotment under such title or 15 acres, or (3) the corn acreage on the farm, in the case of a farm in the commercial corn-producing area, exceeds the farm base acreage for corn or the farm acreage allotment, whichever is in effect, or (4) the acreage planted to feed grains on the farm exceeds the farm base acreage for feed grains, except that such requirement for compliance with the farm base acreage for feed grains shall not apply for 1956. For the purpose of this section, a producer shall not be deemed to have exceeded his farm acreage allotment or farm base acreage, unless such producer knowingly exceeded such allotment or base acreage and, in the case

of wheat, unless such producer knowingly exceeded the farm acreage allotment or 15 acres, whichever is larger.

Reapportionment Prohibited

Sec. 115. No acreage diverted from the production of any commodity subject to acreage allotments as a result of participation in the acreage reserve or conservation reserve programs shall be reapportioned or allotted to any other farm.

Certificate of claimant

Sec. 116. Subject to the provisions of section 105 (b), payment or compensation authorized by this title may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has complied with all requirements for such payment and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief.

Utilization of local and State committees

Sec. 117. In administering this title in the continental United States, the Secretary shall utilize the services of local, county, and State committees established under section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

Utilization of other agencies

Sec. 118. With respect to conservation aspects of any program under this title, the Secretary shall consult with the soil-conservation districts, State forests, State game and fish agencies, land-grant colleges, and other appropriate agencies of State governments, and with the Fish and Wildlife Service, in the formulation of program provisions at the State and county levels. The technical resources of the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, the land-grant colleges, the State foresters, State game and fish agencies, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and other appropriate technical services shall be utilized, so far as practicable, to assure coordination of conservation activities and a solid technical foundation for the program.

Utilization of land use capability data

Sec. 119. In administering this title the Secretary shall utilize to the fullest practicable extent land use capability data, including capability surveys as developed by the Soil Conservation Service, and shall carry forward to completion as rapidly as possible the basic land inventory of the Nation.

Financing

Sec. 120. (a) The Secretary is authorized to utilize the facilities, services, authorities, and funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation in discharging his functions and responsibilities under this title, including payment of costs of administration for the programs authorized under this title: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall, prior to February 1, 1957, or such earlier date as may be practicable, submit to the Congress for immediate reference to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives a full program of all operations under this title which will require the making of expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958; and, after June 30, 1957, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not make any expenditures for carrying out the purposes of this title unless the Corporation has received funds to cover such expenditures from appropriations made to carry out the purposes of this title. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title, including such amounts as may be required to make payments to the Corporation for its actual costs incurred or to be incurred under this section.

(b) All funds available for carrying out the purposes of this title shall be available for transfer to such agencies of the Federal or State governments as the Secretary may request to cooperate or assist in carrying out

this title; and for technical assistance in formulating and carrying out the programs authorized by this title. The Secretary may make such payments in advance of determination of performance.

Finality of determinations

Sec. 121. The facts constituting the basis for any payment or compensation, or the amount thereof, authorized to be made under this title, when officially determined in conformity with applicable regulations prescribed by the Secretary, shall be final and conclusive and shall not be reviewable by any other officer or agency of the Government. In case any producer who is entitled to any payment or compensation dies, becomes incompetent, or disappears before receiving such payment or compensation, or is succeeded by another who renders or completes the required performance, the payment or compensation shall, without regard to any other provisions of law, be made as the Secretary may determine to be fair and reasonable in all the circumstances and so provide by regulations.

Protection of Tenants and Sharecroppers

Sec. 122. In the formulation and administration of programs under this title, the Secretary shall provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers, including provision for sharing, on a fair and equitable basis, in payments or compensation under this title, and including such provision as may be necessary to prevent them from being forced off the farm. Applications to participate in any such program shall specify the basis on which the landlord, tenants, and sharecroppers are to share in such payments or compensation, and no contract under any such program shall be entered into unless such basis is approved by the county committee and incorporated into the contract. The standards prescribed by the Secretary for the guidance of county committees in determining whether any such basis shall be approved shall include the requirement that consideration be given to the respective contributions which would have been made by the landlord, tenants, and sharecroppers in the production of the crops which would have been produced on the acreage diverted from production under the contract and the basis on which they would have shared in such crops or the proceeds thereof.

Penalty for Grazing or Harvesting

Sec. 123. Any producer who knowingly and willfully grazes or harvests any crop from any acreage in violation of a contract entered into under section 103 or 107 shall be subject to a civil penalty equal to 50 percent of the compensation payable for compliance with such contract for the year in which the violation occurs. Such penalty shall be in addition to any amounts required to be forfeited or refunded under the provisions of such contract, and shall be recoverable in a civil suit brought in the name of the United States.

Regulations

Sec. 124. The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as he determines necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

Production on Government Lands Prohibited

Sec. 125. The President shall, with respect to farm lands now or hereafter owned by the Federal Government, restrict insofar as practicable the leasing of such lands for the production of price-supported crops in surplus supply.

Pooling of Conservation Reserve Land

Sec. 126. Whenever management of family farms or optimum land use will be aided, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to permit farmers to pool their rights to participate jointly in the conservation reserve program on property other than their home farms.

TITLE II—SURPLUS DISPOSAL

Program of Orderly Liquidation

Sec. 201. (a) The Commodity Credit Corporation shall, as rapidly as possible consistent with its existing authority, the operation of the price-support program, and orderly liquidation, dispose of all stocks of agricultural commodities held by it.

(b) The Secretary shall submit to Congress within 90 days after the enactment of this act detailed programs, with recommendations for any additional legislation needed to carry out such program, (1) for the disposition of surplus commodities as required by subsection (a) above; (2) for a food stamp plan or similar program for distribution through States (including the District of Columbia, the Territories, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands) and local units of Government of future surplus production to needy persons in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, so as to prevent the accumulation of commodities in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation; and (3) for strategic stockpiling of foodstuffs and other agricultural products (A) inside the United States and (B) outside the United States as authorized in section 415 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954. The Secretary shall report annually on his operations under subsection (a) and such reports shall show—

(1) the quantities of surplus commodities on hand;

(2) the methods of disposition utilized and the quantities disposed of during the preceding 12 months;

(3) the methods of disposition to be utilized and the estimated quantities that can be disposed of during the succeeding 12 months;

(4) a detailed program for the expansion of markets for surplus agricultural commodities through marketing and utilization research and improvement of marketing facilities; and

(5) recommendations for additional legislation necessary to accomplish the purposes of this section.

Extra-Long Staple Cotton

Sec. 202. (a) Hereafter the quota for cotton having a staple length of one and one-eighth inches or more, established September 20, 1939, pursuant to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, shall apply to the same grades and staple lengths included in the quota when such quota was initially established. Such quota shall provide for cotton having a staple length of one and eleven-sixteenths inches and longer, and shall establish dates for the quota year which will recognize and permit entry to conform to normal marketing practices and requirements for such cotton.

(b) Beginning not later than August 1, 1956, the Commodity Credit Corporation is directed to sell for export at competitive world prices its stocks of domestically produced extra long staple cotton on hand on the date of enactment of this act. The amount offered and the price accepted by the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be such as to dispose of such quantity in an orderly manner and within a reasonable period of time.

Agreements Limiting Imports

Sec. 203. The President may, whenever he determines such action appropriate, negotiate with representatives of foreign governments in an effort to obtain agreements limiting the export from such countries and the importation into the United States of any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom or textiles or textile products, and the President is authorized to issue regulations governing the entry or withdrawal from warehouse of any such commodity, product, textiles, or textile products to carry out any such agreement. Nothing

herein shall affect the authority provided under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933) as amended.

Appropriation To Supplement Section 32 Funds

Sec. 204. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, the sum of \$500 million to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to further carry out the provisions of section 32, Public Law 320, 74th Congress, as amended (7 U. S. C. 612c), subject to all provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appropriated by such section, except that up to 50 percent of such \$500 million may be devoted during any fiscal year to any one agricultural commodity or the products thereof.

Transfer of Bartered Materials to Supplemental Stockpile

Sec. 205. (a) Strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural commodities or products, unless acquired for the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U. S. C. 98-98h), or for other purposes shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104 (b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U. S. C. 1704).

(b) Strategic materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural commodities or products may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, free of duty.

(c) In order to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for materials transferred to the supplemental stockpile there are hereby authorized to be appropriated amounts equal to the value of any materials so transferred. The value of any such material for the purpose of this subsection, shall be the lower of the domestic market price or the Commodity Credit Corporation's investment therein as of the date of such transfer, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Surplus Disposal Administrator

Sec. 206. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to appoint an agricultural surplus disposal administrator, at a salary rate of not exceeding \$15,000 per annum, whose duties shall include such responsibility for activities of the Department, including those of the Commodity Credit Corporation, relating to the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities as the Secretary may direct.

Payment of Ocean Freight

Sec. 207. The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) The first sentence of section 103 (a) is amended by striking out the word "and" following the words "handling costs," and by inserting immediately before the period the following: "and, (3) all Commodity Credit Corporation funds expended for ocean freight costs authorized under title II hereof for purposes of section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended."

(b) Section 201 is amended by striking out "f. o. b. vessels in United States ports."

(c) The first sentence of section 203 is amended to read as follows: "Not more than \$500 million (including the Corporation's investment in such commodities) shall be expended for all such transfers and for other costs authorized by this title." Section 203 is further amended by adding at the end of the section the following: "Such transfers may include delivery f. o. b. vessels in United States ports and, upon a determination by the President that it is necessary to accomplish the purposes of this title or of section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, ocean freight charges from United States ports to designated ports of entry

abroad may be paid from funds available to carry out this title on commodities transferred pursuant hereto or donated under said section 416. Funds required for ocean freight costs authorized under this title may be transferred by the Commodity Credit Corporation to such other Federal agency as may be designated by the President."

Commission To Recommend Legislation Providing for Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products

Sec. 208. (a) (1) There is hereby established a bipartisan Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products (hereafter referred to as "the Commission"). The Commission shall be composed of 5 members, of whom not more than 3 shall be members of the same political party, to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. In making such appointments the President shall give due consideration to the interests of various segments of agriculture. One of the members so appointed shall be designated as Chairman by the President.

(2) Members of the Commission shall be paid compensation at the rate of \$50 per day and shall be reimbursed for necessary traveling and other expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

(3) The Commission is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of an executive director and such chemists, engineers, agriculturists, attorneys, and other assistants as it may deem necessary. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to provide the Commission with necessary office space, and may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any personnel of the Department of Agriculture to assist the Commission in carrying out its work.

(4) Upon request of the Commission, any other department or agency of the Government having information or data needed by the Commission in carrying out its duties under this section, shall make such information or data available to the Commission for such purposes. The Commission shall take such steps as may be necessary to protect against unauthorized disclosure any such information or data which may be classified for security purposes.

(5) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission in a technical or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

(b) It shall be the duty of the Commission to prepare and present to the Congress, not later than June 15, 1957, the necessary recommendations which in its opinion will bring about the greatest practical use for industrial purposes of agricultural products not needed for human or animal consumption, including, but not limited to, use in the manufacture of rubber, industrial alcohol, motor fuels, plastics, and other products.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sum, not to exceed \$150,000, as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its functions.

(d) Upon submission of the recommendations referred to in subsection (b), the Commission shall cease to exist.

(e) (1) Any bill or joint resolution embodying the recommendations presented to the Congress under subsection (b) shall, upon introduction in the Senate or House of Representatives, be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate or the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, as the case may be. Such committee shall proceed as expedi-

tiously as possible to consider such bill or joint resolution.

(2) This subsection is enacted by the Congress (A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, and (B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as they relate to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

Donation to Penal to Correctional Institutions

SEC. 209. Notwithstanding any other limitations as to the disposal of surplus commodities acquired through price support operations, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized on such terms and under such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem in the public interest, and upon application, to donate food commodities acquired through price support operations to Federal penal and correctional institutions, and to State correctional institutions for minors, other than those in which food service is provided for inmates on a fee, contract, or concession basis.

Federal Irrigation, Drainage, and Flood-Control Projects

SEC. 210. (a) For a period of 3 years from the date of enactment of this act no agricultural commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with subsection (c) to be in surplus supply shall receive any crop loans or Federal farm payments or benefits if grown on any newly irrigated or drained lands within any Federal irrigation or drainage project hereafter authorized unless such lands were used for the production of such commodity prior to the enactment of this act.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall cause to be included in all irrigation, drainage, or flood-control contracts entered into with respect to Federal irrigation, drainage, or flood-control projects hereafter authorized such provisions as they may deem necessary to provide for the enforcement of the provisions of this section. For a period of 3 years from the date of enactment of this act surplus crops grown on lands reclaimed by flood-control projects hereafter authorized and the lands so reclaimed shall be ineligible for any benefits under the soil-bank provisions of this act and under price support legislation.

(c) On or before October 1 of each year the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine and proclaim the agricultural commodities the supplies of which are in excess of estimated requirements for domestic consumption and export plus adequate reserves for emergencies. The commodities so proclaimed shall be considered to be in surplus supply for the purposes of this section during the succeeding crop year.

(d) For the purposes of this section the term "Federal irrigation or drainage project" means any irrigation or drainage project subject to the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) in effect at the date of the adoption of this amendment and any irrigation or drainage project subject to the laws relating to irrigation and drainage administered by the Department of Agriculture or the Secretary of Agriculture.

Processing of Donated Food Commodities

SEC. 211. Section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting before the last sentence thereof a new sentence, as follows: "In addition, in the case of food commodities disposed of under this section, the Commodity Credit Corporation may pay the cost of processing such commodities into a form suitable for home or in-

stitutional use, such processing to be accomplished through private trade facilities to the greatest extent possible."

TITLE III—MARKETING QUOTAS AND ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Extension of Surrender and Reapportionment Provisions for Wheat Acreage Allotments

SEC. 301. Section 334 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out "1955" wherever it appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "1955, 1956, or 1957."

Acreage Allotments for Cotton for 1957 and 1958

SEC. 302. Section 342 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the national marketing quota for cotton for 1957 and 1958 shall be not less than the number of bales required to provide a national acreage allotment for 1957 and 1958 equal to the national acreage allotment for 1956."

Cotton—Small Farm Allotments

SEC. 303. (a) Section 344 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "Provided, That there is hereby established a national acreage reserve consisting of 100,000 acres which shall be in addition to the national acreage allotment; and such reserve shall be apportioned to the States on the basis of their needs for additional acreage for establishing minimum farm allotments under subsection (f) (1), as determined by the Secretary without regard to State and county acreage reserves (except that the amount apportioned to Nevada shall be 1,000 acres), and the additional acreage so apportioned to the State shall be apportioned to the counties on the same basis and added to the county acreage allotment for apportionment to farms pursuant to subsection (f) of this section (except that no part of such additional acreage shall be used to increase the county reserve above 15 percent of the county allotment determined without regard to such additional acreage). Additional acreage apportioned to a State for any year under the foregoing proviso shall not be taken into account in establishing future State acreage allotments. Needs for additional acreage under the foregoing proviso and under the last proviso in subsection (e) shall be determined as though allotments were first computed without regard to subsection (f) (1)."

(b) Section 344 (e) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "Provided further, That if the additional acreage allocated to a State under the proviso in subsection (b) is less than the requirements as determined by the Secretary for establishing minimum farm allotments for the State under subsection (f) (1), the acreage reserved by the State committee under this subsection shall not be less than the smaller of (1) the remaining acreage so determined to be required for establishing minimum farm allotments or (2) 3 percent of the State acreage allotment; and the acreage which the State committee is required to reserve under this proviso shall be allocated to counties on the basis of their needs for additional acreage for establishing minimum farm allotments under subsection (f) (1), and added to the county acreage allotment for apportionment to farms pursuant to subsection (f) of this section (except that no part of such additional acreage shall be used to increase the county reserve above 15 percent of the county allotment determined without regard to such additional acreages)."

(c) Section 344 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by changing paragraph (1) to read as follows:

"(1) Insofar as such acreage is available, there shall be allotted the smaller of the following: (A) four acres; or (B) the highest number of acres planted to cotton in any year of such 3-year period."

(d) The first sentence of section 344 (f) (6) of such act is amended to read as follows: "Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection, if the county committee recommends such action and the Secretary determines that such action will result in a more equitable distribution of the county allotment among farms in the county, the remainder of the county acreage allotment (after making allotments as provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection) shall be allotted to farms other than farms to which an allotment has been made under paragraph (1) (B) of this subsection so that the allotment to each farm under this paragraph together with the amount of the allotment of such farm under paragraph (1) (A) of this subsection shall be a prescribed percentage (which percentage shall be the same for all such farms in the county) of the average acreage planted to cotton on the farm during the 3 years immediately preceding the year for which such allotment is determined, adjusted as may be necessary for abnormal conditions affecting plantings during such 3-year period: *Provided*, That the county committee may in its discretion limit any farm acreage allotment established under the provisions of this paragraph for any year to an acreage not in excess of 50 percent of the cropland on the farm, as determined pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection: *Provided further*, That any part of the county acreage allotment not apportioned under this paragraph by reason of the initial application of such 50-percent limitation shall be added to the county acreage reserve under paragraph (3) of this subsection and shall be available for the purposes specified therein."

(e) The amendments made by this section shall be effective only with respect to 1957 and 1958 crops. For the 1956 crop, an acreage in each State equal to the acreage allotted in such State which the Secretary determines will not be planted, placed in the acreage reserve or conservation reserve, or considered as planted under section 377 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, may be apportioned by the Secretary among farms in such State having allotments of less than the smaller of the following: (1) four acres, or (2) the highest number of acres planted to cotton in any of the years 1953, 1954, and 1955.

Minimum State Acreage Allotments for 1956 Rice Crop

SEC. 304. Section 353 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding to subsection (c) a new paragraph (5) to read as follows:

"(5) Each of the State acreage allotments for 1956 heretofore proclaimed by the Secretary, after adding thereto any acreage apportioned to farms in the State from the reserve acreage set aside pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, shall be increased by such amount as may be necessary to provide such State with an allotment of not less than 85 percent of its final allotment established for 1955. Any additional acreage required to provide such minimum allotment shall be additional to the national acreage allotment. In any State having county acreage allotments for 1956, the increase in the State allotment shall be apportioned among counties in the State on the same basis as the State allotment was heretofore apportioned among the counties, but without regard to adjustments for trends in acreage."

Increase in Peanut Marketing Penalties

SEC. 305. Effective beginning with the 1956 crop, section 359 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by amending the first sentence thereof to read as follows: "The marketing of any peanuts in excess of the marketing quota for the farm on which such peanuts are produced, or the marketing of peanuts from any farm for which no acreage allotment was determined, shall be subject to a penalty at a rate equal to 75 percent of the support price for peanuts for the marketing year (August 1-July 31)."

Collection of Peanut Marketing Penalties

SEC. 306. Section 359 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding 2 new subsections as follows:

"(d) The person liable for payment or collection of the penalty provided by this section shall be liable also for interest thereon at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date the penalty becomes due until the date of payment of such penalty.

"(e) Until the amount of the penalty provided by this section is paid, a lien on the crop of peanuts with respect to which such penalty is incurred, and on any subsequent crop of peanuts subject to marketing quotas in which the person liable for payment of the penalty has an interest shall be in effect in favor of the United States."

Preservation of Unused Acreage Allotments

SEC. 307. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 376 a new section as follows:

"Preservation of Unused Acreage Allotments"

"Sec. 377. In any case in which, during any year within the period 1956 to 1959, inclusive, for which acreage planted to such commodity on any farm is less than the acreage allotment for such farm, the entire acreage allotment for such farm shall be considered for purposes of future farm acreage allotments to have been planted to such commodity in such year, but only if the owner or operator of such farm notifies the county committee prior to the 60th day preceding the beginning of the marketing year for such commodity of his desire to preserve such allotment. This section shall not be applicable in any case in which the amount of the commodity required to be stored to postpone or avoid payment of penalty has been reduced because the allotment was not fully planted. Nothing herein shall be construed to permit the allotment to any other farm of the acreage with respect to which notice is given under this section."

Acreage Requirements for Price Support on Corn and Other Feed Grains

SEC. 308. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whenever base acreages are in effect for corn, the Secretary shall require, as a condition of eligibility for price support on corn, that the producer (1) devote an acreage of cropland (tilled in normal rotation), at the option of the producer, to either the acreage reserve program for corn or the conservation reserve program, equal to 15 percent of such producer's farm base acreage for corn, and (2) not exceed such farm base acreage for corn. Corn acreage allotments shall not be effective for the 1956 crop.

(b) Not later than December 15, 1956, the Secretary shall conduct a referendum of producers of corn in 1956 in the commercial corn-producing area to determine whether such producers favor a price-support program as provided in subsection (c) of this section for the 1957 and subsequent crops in lieu of acreage allotments as provided in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and price support as provided in section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if two-thirds or more of the producers voting in the referendum conducted pursuant to subsection (b) hereof favor a price-support program as provided in this subsection (c), no acreage allotment of corn shall be established for the commercial corn-producing area for any county, or for any farm, with respect to the 1957 and subsequent crops, and price support made available for such crops by Commodity Credit Corporation shall be at such level as the Secretary determines will assist producers in marketing corn in the normal channels of trade but not encourage the uneconomic production of corn.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for each year in which an acreage reserve program will be in effect for corn, the level of price support for corn produced outside the commercial corn-producing area shall be 85 percent of the level of price support for corn produced in the commercial corn-producing area, and the level of price support for each of the commodities, grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats, shall be a percentage of the parity price for each such commodity which is 5 percentage points less than the percentage of the parity price announced in advance of the planting season pursuant to section 406 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, as the level of price support for corn in the commercial corn-producing area. The Secretary shall require as a condition of eligibility for price support of such feed grains (corn produced outside the commercial corn-producing area, grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats) that the producer (1) except in the case of new feed grain farms, devote an acreage on the farm to either the acreage reserve program for feed grains or the conservation reserve program equal to 15 percent of the farm base acreage established for such feed grains under section 103 (c) hereof, and (2) not plant a total acreage of such feed grains on the farm in excess of 85 percent of such farm base acreage for feed grains. The acreage required to be devoted to either the acreage reserve program for feed grains or the conservation reserve program as a condition of eligibility for price support for such feed grains shall be in addition to any acreage required to be devoted to either the acreage reserve program for corn or the conservation reserve program as a condition of eligibility for price support for corn produced in the commercial corn-producing area. Notwithstanding any other provision hereof, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available price support for the 1956 crop of grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats at the levels announced prior to the enactment of this subsection, and for the 1956 crop of corn produced outside the commercial corn-producing area at 75 percent of the level for corn produced in the commercial corn-producing area, to any producer who meets the requirements of eligibility therefor but who does not meet the additional requirements for price support prescribed by this subsection.

TITLE IV—FORESTRY PROVISIONS

Assistance to States for Tree Planting and Reforestation

SEC. 401. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that building up and maintaining a level of timber growing stocks adequate to meet the Nation's domestic needs for a dependable future supply of industrial wood is essential to the public welfare and security; that assisting in improving and protecting the more than 50 million acres of idle non-Federal and Federal lands for this purpose would not only add to the economic strength of the Nation, but also bring increased public benefits from other values associated with forest cover; and that it is the policy of the Congress that the Secretary of Agriculture in order to encourage, promote, and assure fully adequate future resources

of readily available timber should assist the States in undertaking needed programs of tree planting.

(b) Any State forester or equivalent State official may submit to the Secretary of Agriculture a plan for forest land tree planting and reforestation for the purpose of effecting the policy hereinbefore stated.

(c) When the Secretary of Agriculture has approved the plan, he is hereby authorized and directed to assist the State in carrying out such plan, which assistance may include giving of advice and technical assistance and furnishing financial contributions: *Provided*, That, for the non-Federal forest land tree planting and reforestation, the financial contribution expended by the Federal Government during any fiscal year to assist the State to carry out the plan shall not exceed the amount expended by the State for the same purposes during the same fiscal year, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make financial contributions on the certificate of the State official in charge of the administration of the plan as to the amount of expenditures made by the State.

(d) In any plan that coordinates forest lands under the jurisdiction of any Federal agency other than the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture shall obtain the cooperation and assistance of the Federal agency having jurisdiction and the appropriate State forester in the approval and carrying out of the plan.

(e) The Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe such rules and regulations as may be appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section.

(f) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the objects of this section, such sums to remain available until expended.

Mr. COOLEY (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as having been read and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of asking the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], a question for the record.

In the original conference report on H. R. 12, there was a statement to the effect that since the conference recognized that the Department of Agriculture had the power to make the same differentials in the loans offered to cotton producers on the various types of spotted cotton, including specifically light spots and heavy spots as are customarily made by the trade that the Committee of the Conference did not attempt to write any language into that bill relative to making such differentials, but it was pointed out that the committee was aware of the past practice of the Commodity Credit Corporation of neglecting or refusing to make make such differentials, and that the committee was of the opinion that the Department should exercise this power. No reference is made in the bill presently before us to such differentials.

I wish that the chairman would tell us for the record if there were any intention on the part of the committee to recede from the position adopted by the committee on the conference that the Department of Agriculture should exercise

the power it now has in this regard and make the same differential in loans on light spots and heavy spots that is made by the cotton trade.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, for the record, I want to state to the gentleman from Texas that no one can properly interpret this bill as in any wise receding from the position taken by the conference committee in regard to this matter of differentials on spotted cotton. On the contrary, by adopting the same words that were in the conference report, it is intended that the Department of Agriculture should understand that it is the wish of the Congress that such differentials be made.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pose a question to the chairman of our committee. When I vote against this bill, will that bar me from participating in the conservation reserve program?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not see how that could possibly affect the rights of the gentleman from Pennsylvania as a private citizen and as one of the great farmers of the country.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

I wanted to make sure of that point because when the all-bounteous Federal Government begins to pass the gravy, I want to get some.

I shall most surely vote against this bill for reasons which I think should be clear and dear to anyone who cherishes his personal liberty—to anyone who believes that free enterprise is an effective system in producing the most for all.

This soil-bank plan as a method of subsidy could be preferred to the price-support plan, but you must remember it is not here before us as a substitute for price support but an additional scheme to give more for doing nothing.

As a matter of fact, this bill contains provisions with regard to feed grains which constitute a definite expansion of the price-support program. It is quite necessary that we make this expansion because the price-support program on the six basics, operating without any restrictions on diverted acres, has so greatly distorted the production of feed gains that now they must be brought under price supports.

This is typical of the way socialism works. You cannot socialize one segment of agriculture, as we have with the six basic crops, without finding it necessary to proceed to socialize all of agriculture. In this bill, we take the first step to include all feed grains. Next year you will have to proceed to include all other crops.

As a matter of fact, the provision in this bill which enlarges section 32 funds by \$500 million is a step toward full coverage of agriculture. This half billion extra puts pressure on the Secretary of Agriculture to use Federal funds to

rescue every little production group which happens to get in trouble by producing more than the market will take. I hope he doesn't forget the mid-summer production of cucumbers and broccoli.

I am sure any of you who have listened to the debates on the farm program will agree with me that Government management of agriculture is a confused management. You need only listen to the differences of opinion held by the various crop representatives on our committee to realize that each year we pass to the administrative branch of our Government an unworkable program which has in its own specifications the defeat of its own purposes.

Now, we are proposing to add something like \$2 billion to the \$2 billion we have for some years been taking away from taxpayers, the whole sum to go to farmers as sustaining operating capital. All of this is done with the expressed intent of reducing production so as to bring it into sensible balance with the maximum market demands. All this is done without the least recognition of the fact that in agriculture one billion of operating capital will produce 5 billion in gross product.

Can it be that this Congress is naive enough to believe that this loading of farmers with operating capital will reduce the burdensome surpluses, or is this simply a compromise measure which has come out of the competition between both parties in bidding for the next election?

Some day those who submissively pay this bill will rise up and stop this nonsense.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer four amendments in series.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: On page 49, line 4, change the period to a colon and add the following: "Provided, That price support may be made available to any producer who does not meet the foregoing requirements at such level, not in excess of the level of price support to producers who meet such requirements, as the Secretary determines will facilitate the effective operation of the price-support program."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, may I explain to the House that this is but the first of a series of four amendments which, taken together, are expected to resolve most of our differences in regard to the corn and feed-grain sections of this bill? I, of course, want to make it perfectly plain that this very amendment does a thing that I thought was a mistake. I did not approve the President's action in supporting excess corn at \$1.25 per bushel, but we have to get the best kind of workable bill we can, and there has been a serious effort on both sides of the House to try to work out our difficulties, and this amendment is part of the complete program.

I want to express my appreciation to the members of my committee, particularly the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY], the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE], and of course

our former chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], all of whom have worked with those of us on our side and with the leadership on both sides to try to work out some solution whereby we could find an answer to this difficult problem of feed grains and corn.

This, the first of these four amendments, simply assures that there will be no legal barrier to carrying out the price support of \$1.25 a bushel for noncompliance corn within the commercial Corn Belt that the President has already announced. I doubt that there is any legal barrier to it now, but in an effort to be abundantly sure it was felt by many of the Members that these extra words should be included.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does this amendment set aside the order of the Secretary fixing noncompliance corn at a support price of \$1.25 a bushel?

Mr. POAGE. The amendment frankly was written by Members on the gentleman's side. It was presented to me with the understanding it would protect that action. It is my understanding it does do that. I wonder if the gentleman from Indiana could give us his understanding of that provision.

Mr. HALLECK. I am quite sure this proviso which the gentleman seeks to put in the bill makes it abundantly clear that there is no interference intended with the Executive order that has been made already fixing a support price for noncompliance corn in a commercial area at \$1.25 a bushel.

Mr. POAGE. It is my intention in offering it that it should do exactly that, even though I disagree with the basic philosophy of the order that was issued, but since it has been issued we are faced with a fact.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it the intention of the gentleman that the order of \$1.25 a bushel for noncompliance corn in the commercial area will stand for 1956?

Mr. POAGE. That is right, along with the understanding of the next three amendments that we will make certain modifications in the feed grain provisions, and that with that we are all reasonably well satisfied.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOPE. I simply want to take this occasion to express my appreciation and the appreciation, I am sure, of other members of the Committee on Agriculture on this side of the aisle for the great amount of work and the splendid work the gentleman has done in trying to work out a solution of this problem of corn and other feed grains. I am in hearty accord with the amendment which the gentleman has proposed although, like the gentleman himself, I am a little dubious about the policy. But, I do believe under the circumstances, we must reconcile the situation and so I am in favor of the amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand it, a farmer can raise all the corn and the feed grains that he wants to and have a support price of \$1.25 a bushel.

Mr. POAGE. Provided he lives in the commercial corn area.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, but suppose he complies—suppose he is in compliance—then, what would he get?

Mr. POAGE. He would get \$1.50 on corn and he will get on feed grains 5 parity points less than the support price of corn in the commercial corn area, if he complies. If he does not comply on feed grains, he gets 70 percent.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I certainly have no objection to what the gentleman proposes by the immediate amendment, but I would like to ask a question. Seemingly, that does validate the action of the Secretary in creating a \$1.25 guaranty on all corn produced regardless of the quota in the commercial corn area. As I brought up yesterday with reference to this particular question, on the one hand, due to the Secretary's order, which I approve of by the way because it means additional millions of dollars throughout the corn belt, we are told as corn farmers that we can produce all the corn we wish and are guaranteed \$1.25 a bushel for that production. But, now in the bill before us, the soil bank bill, and I refer to the bottom of page 23, we have an exception. We say to those same farmers, "Now, if you do just that—if you 'produce an acre above your allotment, your base acreage,' and I refer to line 7 on page 24, you are not entitled in any way to put any of your acreage under the soil bank bill." I am asking this question of the membership today and I might add that I can read that language with no different construction than that because it simply states "the corn acreage on the farm, in the case of a farm in the commercial corn-producing area, exceeds the farm base acreage for corn or the farm acreage allotment, whichever is in effect, or." That is an exception. In other words, it says if that is in excess, the hundreds of thousands of corn farmers throughout America cannot put, what they would like to put under either portion of this act.

I sincerely hope that the House will see fit—and I am asking the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] at this time, if it would not be possible to do so, because of the existing circumstances to strike out section 3 on page 24, and thus make it permissible for these hundreds of thousands of corn farmers to put several

million additional acres into the soil bank. Otherwise, I do not see where in our vast corn area we are going to do what we all want to do, and that is to get some of that land out of production. That is my personal opinion. As the gentleman knows, I have discussed this matter with him and other members of the subcommittee, and they tell me I have nothing to fear in this regard, but I still read that language as it is, that it is an absolute prohibition against any man who plants an acre above his corn allotment to receive any payments out of title I in this bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. I, as one member of the Committee on Agriculture, want to compliment the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] on the fine work he has done, but I would like to have him discuss how the Secretary of Agriculture comes to the conclusion as to what is noncommercial and what is commercial corn acreage. That would answer the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. If we do not understand the difference between commercial and noncommercial, I do not see that we can come to any conclusions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. HILL), Mr. POAGE was recognized for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, for fear that I may become enmeshed in a side shooting scrape, I want to make plain and before I go into details about what either the gentlemen are questioning me about, that in the first place I do not pose as an expert on corn. But we do have in these four amendments, taken together, a program that many of us believe, including a great many of those in whose judgment on the problems of corn I have much confidence, will reasonably solve both the corn and feed corn program. It is not what I want. It is not what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] wanted. It is not what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] wanted. It is not what anyone wanted. But it is something on which most of us can agree—something which we hope will give us a well-rounded program. The question asked by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] points up some possible question that is in the mind of a great many of us, and I must answer that before I proceed with the question asked by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. The gentleman from Colorado said, "What is the difference between commercial and noncommercial corn areas?" Ever since we have had a farm program we have had a commercial and noncommercial area. The commercial corn area is that area in the United States in which corn is possibly the major crop, to the exclusion of all others. It includes those counties in those States only where corn is king, and where corn surpasses all other crops in importance. We made this distinction because bas-

ically in that commercial corn area you have a great feeding area, where people produce corn, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] explained yesterday, and many of them feed it on their own places. You find a situation different from that of the other man who is just selling corn.

In the noncommercial farm area, which includes the greatest part of the United States, but the smaller portion so far as the production of corn is concerned, we look upon corn as only one of the other crops along with oats, barley, cotton, wheat, and other types of crops. Basically your commercial corn area is what we know as the Corn Belt, the States of Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, parts of Missouri, and spilling over into some other States. In that area we support corn at a higher figure than in the noncommercial area. I do not say that I am for it, but the President has announced a support of \$1.25 per bushel for noncommercial corn within the last few days. This is an effort to try to protect that approach for the man who grows more corn than his acreage allotment allows in the Corn Belt.

The gentleman from Minnesota raises the question that if up in the Corn Belt you do not go into the soil bank you will not get the high supports on your corn, therefore he loses; but if he goes into the soil bank he gets the soil-bank payments.

At some point, whether rightly or wrongly, we in Congress felt that we should give some incentive to bring these corn people into the soil bank. Rather than work a hardship upon the people affected we said that instead of having only 43 million acres of allotted corn as we will have if we do not pass this bill, but if you pass this bill you will have 51 million acres of allotted corn in the United States. Fifty-one million represents a very substantial increase and it means that for the average man over the United States. It does not apply to the gentleman from Minnesota because he explained his own situation, and I may say it does not apply to many of his neighbors and friends, but for the average man over the United States that means a reduction of only about 8 percent in corn acreage, because we only planted about 56 million acres of commercial corn last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

(On request of Mr. FULTON and by unanimous consent, Mr. POAGE was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman has spoken of the land that is under allotment for greater production in your commercial area as 43 million for the current year, and it is to be increased under this bill to 51 million. The gentleman has commented that there was really an increase of the corn acreage of these corn farmers. There is not because from the 51 million will be taken 13 percent for the conservation reserve, the soil bank, and that will be 7,600,000

acres. So when you subtract that much from 51 million acres you are within a couple of hundred thousand acres of the 43 million which you have right now. I ask some expert here if that is not correct. Is that correct?

Mr. POAGE. Had the gentleman not interrupted me in the middle of a sentence he would have observed that I did not make the statement attributed to me. I did not say that it increased the individual's corn acreage; on the contrary I simply pointed out the facts of this bill. It would raise the total allotted acreage from 43 million to 51 million.

Mr. FULTON. But that does not take into consideration the conservation reserve program that will cut it right down to 43 million acres.

Mr. POAGE. Doubtless there would be some such result if 100 percent of the corn growers in the area were to participate in the soil bank, but that is something that is not going to happen, something that never has happened. But when they go into the soil bank they have their income taken care of under the payments in the agricultural reserve. In other words, the corn farmer is allowed to take in a greater income this coming year under this bill than he would if you do not pass this bill. That to me is the vitally important thing.

Mr. FULTON. The last question is this: Actually should not in the conference report something be brought up to take out this compulsory or mandatory provision in reference to price supports where corn in the commercial areas will get 81 percent of parity. It is really compulsory. For 43 million out of 57 million planted acres in these commercial areas it will be 81 percent.

Mr. POAGE. The farmer will get 86.2 percent in these commercial areas if he complies.

Mr. FULTON. In this report here it says they are going to get 81 percent. I will read from page 2:

It would cut down the acreage of feed grain and give producers support prices of approximately 81 percent of parity if they comply with the acreage reduction.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman is talking about feed grains. He is not talking about corn. The President has given corn 86.2 if the man complies in the commercial Corn Belt. For noncommercial corn about 69 percent.

Mr. FULTON. But the point I am making is this: Is that not a compulsory price support if the farmer who produces corn in these commercial areas goes under this program?

Mr. POAGE. If he goes under this program and takes advantage of the soil bank I would assume he would also take advantage of the support. It is not compulsory that he do so.

Mr. FULTON. Is that not contrary to the President's views?

Mr. POAGE. We do not think so.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The thing I am calling to the attention of the House here is in an effort to try to bring this bill somewhat along the

general idea that I originally had years ago when I first advocated the soil bank in the Congress of the United States. The theory was simply this: Anyplace in America where there is good cropland that a farmer wants to take out of production, let us give him the right to do so. We speak in terms of acres, but what we are after is pounds and bushels of commodities temporarily surplus to our consumption. There are too many encumbrances, especially in that one subsection, which will make it impossible for hundreds and thousands of farmers to do what they would like to do and that is simply to help in this great constructive movement of which I am sure the Congress is going to be proud in years to come. Our real objective is to reduce our producing acreage to the point where we can get the supply approximately down to demand. That is one of the basic and fundamental needs for the curing of what ails agriculture.

But here in subsection 3 we are saying to thousands of corn farmers: If you take advantage of what the Secretary of Agriculture has offered in the past few days, and you have a \$1.25 a bushel support for any amount of corn acreage you wish to put in, and that applies to the commercial Corn Belt, or even if you plant 1 or 2 acres more than that amount, you cannot take other land you possess out of production and put it into the soil bank. That is what I am objecting to. I am objecting to a subsection, a little innocuous subsection, which will prevent perhaps 3 or 4 million acres of good land in the heavy-producing areas of our country from being taken out of production and put into this bank as it should be.

It is a fact accomplished that we have now a guaranty of \$1.25 a bushel. This amendment just offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is validating that particular \$1.25 guaranty. I am not arguing for anything but the betterment of this bill. I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that we should do as it was the original intent of the bill to do and that is to try in every way possible to get 40 million acres, approximately 8 percent, of our good crop producing land out of production without any hindrances in the way of farmers to take any of their land out of production simply because of this one little subsection in the bill.

Although this problem applies throughout the commercial Corn Belt, my first concern is for the farmers in my own Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota. Let me illustrate what this means in terms of my district alone.

These figures not only point up my argument on this little subsection, but they may also let a few of you know why I am fighting the farmers' battles day in and day out in the Congress. You may be somewhat surprised at the scope of farming in this most intensely agricultural district in the United States.

According to the last farm census, we had about 8 million acres of farmland in our district. That is about one-half as much farmland as you will find in all nine North Atlantic States—including New York and Pennsylvania—devoted to

harvested crops. It is about one-third as much farmland as is devoted to harvested crops in the eight South Atlantic States including Delaware and Florida.

In 1954, we had almost 2 million acres of corn in our district, about 2.3 million acres of small grains, and 800,000 acres of soybeans. There, in my congressional district alone, you have over 5 million acres of highly productive land devoted to the output of feed grains. If we fully applied the soil bank in my district and took 8 percent of the acreage out of production that could well mean 400,000 fewer acres producing surplus feed grains.

This fertile land offers an equally fertile field for the promotion of intelligent retirement of surplus-producing land to conservation, and yet by this subsection you may well deny virtually every farmer in my district the opportunity to join in this commendable effort we are making to bring supply and demand into better balance. That is something for the gentlemen representing feed-grain producing districts outside of the commercial Corn Belt to think about. If your farmers are to enjoy the principal benefit of this soil-bank program; namely, higher prices for what they produce because of better balanced markets—then you had best give heed to my warning this day.

As far as I am concerned, I would have made the soil bank entirely free and independent of any necessity of abiding by any price supports. Why? If you take 40 million acres of land out of production, that is bound to reflect upon the strength and the position of all agricultural commodities in the United States, and the varying production of corn, soybeans, oats, or barley will have a natural flow, just as water flows downhill. By taking that 40 million acres out of production—and I sincerely hope this bill will accomplish it, and I am trying to help accomplish it—you will be taking out of production about a 1-billion-gross-bushel equivalent of material produced by the farmers for which we have no current market. That is what I am contending for here—to try to make it a better bill and to try to bring it into line with what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] and I originally intended. It is simply a bill to take land out of production so as to bring demand and production more in line.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman for his long-standing interest in the accomplishment of a soil-bank program. As he has pointed out, he was one of the first, and certainly one of the most active, promoters of that sort of a plan. We all realize that a few days ago when we had certain problems before us with respect to trying to accomplish a soil-bank plan we recognized the gentleman's long-standing interest in that sort of a program. We were seeking to bring to passage a soil-bank bill introduced by him and bearing his name.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I appreciate that statement by the gentleman, who speaks for our Republican leadership in the House.

Mr. HALLECK. I am sure the gentleman does. However, I would just like to say this to the gentleman. All of us can understand a certain amount of merit in what he is urging, but at the same time I am sure he also would agree with me that these soil-bank provisions, except for the matter of advance payments, which we will be confronted with here a little later on, have been worked out after many, many days and weeks of laborious effort, and the bill as it is presently before us, insofar as the soil bank is concerned, represents very substantial progress in the direction of what the gentleman has been urging all through these years.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and the spirit in which they are made. In view of the fact that leaders such as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], and the gentlemen on the other side, gentlemen in whom I have much confidence, feel that perhaps this issue is not such a dangerous one as I personally think it is, I am going to bow to their judgment. Beyond all else I want to see this bill go through today, and I do not intend to do anything that will prevent its passage. However, I have made my point as to what I think.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. On the matter of the pending amendment, so that my position may be understood, I think that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], which validates the executive order heretofore made, is highly desirable and should be included in this legislation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I may say also that there are other matters in here, particularly dealing with the provision with respect to feed grains, that do not altogether suit me. And, I would make some more substantial changes than have been here indicated. As I understand, there will be amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], which will make substantial changes, and I think "substantial" means, if I may say so, in the feed grain section. Speaking for myself, I am going to support those amendments, although, as I say, if I had my way, why, they would go quite a lot further than will be undertaken here so far as that problem is concerned.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In conclusion, I am convinced that many of my friends who know this subject just as well or better than I do feel that there is nothing to fear along the lines that I have expressed. Nevertheless, I still hold those convictions. I do not intend to press my point any further. Let us go ahead and pass this bill.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, it has been called to my attention that a gentleman by the name of Arthur Klein is running in the Democratic primary in Brooklyn, N. Y., against our distinguished colleague, JOHN ROONEY. I want to assure the House that it is not I who is running against him. If I were tempted to run for Congress in any district other than my own, I certainly would not run in his district, because I consider him to be one of the ablest and one of the finest Members in this House. He has done a great job. He is always on the job. He is one of the many capable members of the great Committee on Appropriations. When we of the New York delegation seek to do anything in behalf of our constituents, we always find Mr. ROONEY on the job here in Washington. I might say that I personally owe him a great debt of gratitude because every time we have wanted to do something, particularly with regard to the Middle East, he has been in the forefront of the fight to speed defensive arms to the State of Israel. As a matter of fact, he was among the first members of the American Christian Committee for Palestine before there was a new State. He has been a consistent two-fisted fighter for every just cause.

I can only say to him that anybody in his district who knows me should know, and I want him to know, that I support JOHN J. ROONEY 100 percent.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to speak briefly of the surplus disposal provisions for agricultural commodities in the bill. As a matter of fact those Members representing the cities should be interested in this bill from that point of view, because this bill will permit the Secretary of Agriculture to process and reprocess foods for family and institutional use in certain suitable units.

Section 211 contains a provision that "the Commodity Credit Corporation may pay the cost of processing such commodities into a form suitable for home or institutional use, such processing to be accomplished through private trade facilities to the greatest extent possible."

May I point out to the membership that those Representatives who have unemployment in their areas may, through the Department of Agriculture, get a good surplus disposal program going in their district. Together with Mr. Corbett, Mr. Eberharter and, before her death, Mrs. Vera Buchanan, we Congressmen in Allegheny County, Pa., helped set up a program of surplus food disposal, to underprivileged people, which has been very successful.

We Congressmen worked out the program in cooperation with the executive board members of the Control Labor Union of Pittsburgh, and the county and State officials.

In Allegheny County, Pa., where we have one of the greatest prosperities we have ever had, we still have 164,000 underprivileged persons who are on the Federal surplus-food program covering free distribution under local voluntary citizen boards. That means we are supplementing the local public assistance, and charitable institutions, as well as supplementing the income of people who have an income of less than the requirement for eligibility, for example, \$110 a month for an individual person. I hope the proposed Federal stamps program is prepared and soon adopted by the Department of Agriculture, and that the current surplus-food disposal projects are continued.

I wish to express my thanks to the House Committee on Agriculture as well as the Department of Agriculture for their cooperation in helping our four Pittsburgh and Allegheny County Congressmen to work out the setup of this fine surplus-food distribution project in Allegheny County.

There is a problem that is coming up in the disposal of surplus commodities within the United States, and that is the problem of storage near the major points of distribution. Unfortunately, prior to the institution of the surplus-food disposal programs of any size in the United States the United States Department of Agriculture set up its warehouses either at the point of purchase or loan, or at the point of production of surplus agricultural commodities. That means there are no Federal warehouses now established at the points of consumption. With the Federal surplus-food program getting so large, it now has become incumbent upon the local communities to pay these costs of storage prior to distribution, that the Federal Government should be paying anyhow. The Federal Government has to store the surplus products somewhere, so why not near the point of disposal where most efficient?

May I ask this question of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee: Is it not possible for the city of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County to have a Federal surplus commodity storage warehouse located in or around that large tristate industrial area, when we have such a tremendous disposal program in operation, that is helping this farm program?

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman will yield, I may say I agree with the observation the gentleman has just made. Congressman HOLLAND, from Pittsburgh, from the 30th District, spoke to me about the very problem the gentleman is now discussing.

Mr. FULTON. His and my districts adjoin. I know he is very much interested in this project, as are Mr. CORBETT and Mr. EBERHARTER.

Mr. COOLEY. He has expressed the desire that storage facilities be located near the centers where these foods may be consumed by our own people.

May I say that our committee has been intensely interested in the subject. Recently we had the Defense Department, Civil Defense, and Department of Agri-

culture officials before our committee discussing this very subject. At that time I asked the question whether consideration had been given to the advisability of establishing these storage warehouses not only at appropriate places inside this country but at other places out on our defense perimeter such as in the Hawaiian Islands and other places where these foods might be needed.

Mr. FULTON. May I comment on that particular point?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. FULTON. In a strategic area like the city of Pittsburgh the Federal Government should have a strategic warehouse for storage of foods, that would save tremendous demands on the railroads in case of trouble, when there would be a transportation shortage for steel and the sinews of defense. The Pittsburgh Federal storage facility could be used in the meantime for this surplus food disposal project, as well as for strategic food purposes for the area. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] agree on that?

Mr. COOLEY. I am sure he does agree on that. He is anxious for that to be done.

If I may proceed a little further, we were advised by some official from the Department of Defense that the military people have provided for their own civilian personnel attached to the Military Establishment. We did ask the civilian defense officials what consideration had been given to the matter of distributing these foods and storing them elsewhere in the country, and we were told that they had some sort of program called Grandma's Pantry. That means everybody should stow away in their own pantry sufficient food for such emergency as might occur. They all agreed that the entire matter had been left to the decision of the Department of Agriculture. We have not pursued the matter further because we have been otherwise busily engaged. But I can assure the gentleman that our committee will pursue the matter further and that we will insist that adequate food supplies be stored in the Hawaiian Islands or Okinawa or wherever they can be stored.

Mr. FULTON. And in Pittsburgh.

Mr. COOLEY. And Pittsburgh.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Then, I would like to ask this of the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee. Under the current legislation now before the House, is it not perfectly possible within that authority for the Department of Agriculture to have a storage warehouse for surplus agricultural commodities within the Allegheny County or the western Pennsylvania area, for western Pennsylvania, eastern Ohio, and northern West Virginia.

Mr. COOLEY. There cannot be any question about the authority now vested in the Secretary of Agriculture to do just what the gentleman is proposing.

Mr. FULTON. And the Department of Agriculture pay for the storage of the commodities until they are delivered to the local charitable and assistance agencies for distribution?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; if the gentleman will just let me continue to make one further observation—in this very bill we are authorizing the payment of transportation costs from the place of storage here in this country to the port cities in other countries, and we are actually authorizing payment of ocean freight to take these commodities to hungry people in foreign countries.

Mr. FULTON. May I ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], the ranking minority member of the House Agriculture Committee, whether he agrees to that position on the legislative authority of the Department of Agriculture and in this particular bill?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; I am glad to say to the gentleman as far as this bill is concerned, I agree entirely with what has been said. And I know of no other legislation on the books that would not be in harmony with this. There may be, but I do not know of any.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman because this proposal will save the county of Allegheny alone \$8,000 to \$15,000 a month for storage costs.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In line with what the gentleman has to say about Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh is one of the target cities in the event of enemy attack.

Mr. FULTON. You are certainly right—it is one of the major United States targets.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Which means that a million or several million people in the area, within the fallout area.

Mr. FULTON. Three million people.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. They will be required to move out of that area and they must be fed.

Mr. FULTON. And we have mountainous and hilly land so that there are very few main traffic arteries to get out of the city.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for 2 additional minutes as I have one more question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have introduced a bill that provides for the establishment of survival food depots outside of the fallout area.

Mr. FULTON. I will be very glad to support the gentleman in that bill for the establishment of strategic food reserves near our United States industrial areas and where strategically necessary for our United States continental, Territory, and advance base defense.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That will take care of the people who may be driven out of Pittsburgh, the evacuees from Pittsburgh in the event of enemy attack.

Mr. FULTON. That is very fine. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. I want to concur in what the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture has said about the interest of the Committee on Agriculture in this very problem with which the gentleman is concerned. May I call the gentleman's specific attention to title II of the bill which is headed "Surplus Disposal" and found on page 30 of the bill; among other things it requires the Secretary of Agriculture within 90 days after the enactment of this legislation to make any recommendations he sees fit for the disposal of agricultural surplus commodities. Starting at line 22, reference is made to the strategic stockpiling of foodstuffs and other agricultural products.

Mr. FULTON. That is right, and I strongly favor those provisions of this legislation.

Mr. HOEVEN. The bill takes care of your problem in every respect and we will be looking forward to the recommendations of the Secretary.

Mr. FULTON. I would recommend the Secretary of Agriculture should take into consideration the setting up of food stamp plans of various kinds in the local communities of the country, so that various plans can be set up to meet the requirements of State and local laws, and take into consideration the economic situation of each community. One type of plan would not fit every community in this country.

Mr. HOEVEN. That is all provided for in title II of the bill.

Mr. FULTON. I thank you very much. I appreciate it and I certainly am going to vote for this program.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. The last time I saw the figures, 80 percent of all this surplus food was going into the State of Pennsylvania. Would you say that means—

Mr. FULTON. There is no doubt that such surplus food distribution is mostly under the program that we Congressmen in Pittsburgh helped set up.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Would you say that means that Pennsylvania Congressmen have been a little more alert to the opportunities in this program?

Mr. FULTON. Well, we in Allegheny County are 2 Republican Congressmen and 2 Democrats that set up the program. We have another Democrat, Mr. HOLLAND, who is now joining us. We took the program out of politics. I might say there are about 16 million pounds of surplus food worth between \$8 million and \$10 million, that have been administered and distributed through the Allegheny County commissioners' office under this Federal surplus commodity program to date.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I have three amendments on the Clerk's desk,

and I ask unanimous consent that they be read and considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. POAGE:

On page 50, line 2, strike the words "each year" and insert in lieu thereof "each of the years 1956 and 1957."

On page 50, line 4, strike the figure "85" and insert in lieu thereof "82½."

On page 50, line 15, after the word "for", insert the word "such."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] and those other members of the committee who have worked most diligently on this corn provision, particularly the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN]; also the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY], the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE], and others who have worked with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], very diligently and faithfully in trying to improve the section we have in this bill, the section to which I referred yesterday in the colloquy with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. It seems this will improve the section, and I hope the amendments will be adopted, and I hope everyone will fully appreciate the efforts of these very devoted public servants who have tried to work out this section.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I would like to join with the distinguished chairman of the committee in expressing the hope that the Committee of the Whole will see fit to adopt these amendments which have been worked out very carefully by the distinguished gentlemen whom the chairman has mentioned, and who have worked out a very satisfactory solution of a very difficult problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALBERT:

Page 5, line 5, after the period at the end of the sentence insert: "In addition to the foregoing, the Secretary is authorized and directed to formulate and carry out during the years 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959 an acreage reserve program for grazing lands under which farmers or ranchers will be compensated for reducing their acreages of grazing lands and making a corresponding reduction in livestock units below a representative period designated by the Secretary. All the provisions of this title not inconsistent therewith shall apply to the grazing lands acreage reserve program."

Page 9, line 17, strike out the period and insert "including grazing lands."

Page 9, line 24, strike out "or" and insert a comma; and insert after "acres", the words "or other standards."

Page 12, line 4, after "\$23,000,000:", insert "grazing lands, \$50,000,000."

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to make

grazing land eligible for participation in the soil-bank program. The amendment should be adopted to round out a program that will be applicable to all segments of agriculture. The objectives of the soil bank are twofold: First, to help eliminate price-depressing surpluses; and second, to help build up and preserve the soil. On both grounds the program should be made applicable to livestock grazing of natural pastures.

Of all phases of agriculture where price-depressing surpluses have accumulated, the problem is most acute in the livestock industry. Cattle population in this country today is at an all-time high. There are more than 97 million head of cattle in the United States at the present time.

Since 1951 the cattle industry has suffered price declines greater than that of any other segment of our agricultural economy, and today the comparative position of the livestock producer is worse than that of any other agricultural producer. In the April 15, 1956, Agricultural Price Index of the Department of Agriculture the parity relationship of beef cattle was 70 percent, of beef calves 71 percent, of lambs 77 percent, of sheep 63 percent. This is an overall average of 70.25 percent as compared to an overall average of 84.6 percent for the basic commodities.

From the high price of 1951 to the fall of 1953, cattle dropped an average of more than 50 percent. Prices of canners and cutters dropped from \$21.55 in April 1951 to less than \$7 by November 1954, a 69-percent decline. Choice steers fell from \$36 in April 1951 to \$21 in June 1953, a 42-percent drop. In the fall of 1955 fat beef cattle were selling in the Chicago market as much as \$11 lower than in the fall of 1954. These price drops have been the direct result of increases in cattle numbers. There were 76.8 million head of cattle at the most recent low point on January 1, 1949. There were 97.5 million head at the most recent high point of January 1, 1956.

This amendment is needed not only to help reduce the livestock surpluses on the ranges of this country but also to take out of pasture our overgrazed range-lands. As previously indicated, we have had consistent increases in cattle numbers for several years, even though we have had over a large area of the United States a severe drought for the past 3 years. This means, of course, that we have increased the grazing load of pastures in all sections of the country. Much of this land is overgrazed and needs to be taken out of production. Already there is evidence of a returning dust bowl. Our natural pastures are a part of our agricultural economy, and along with our croplands our conservation programs should be applied to grazing land.

This amendment should be adopted because it will help maintain a balanced program in diversified farming areas. In many areas, crop and livestock production are part of the overall farming operation. A small farmer engaging in both crop and livestock production will not be able to retire his cropland and retain a balanced program unless he can

put a part of his grazing land in a soil bank. Small farmers will be benefited particularly by this program. Thousands of these small farmers will be unable to participate in the soil-bank program unless grazing lands are included.

This bill in its present form does absolutely nothing for the cattle producer of this country. It may do a lot to him, however. This bill provides for the retirement of cultivated land to grass and trees. It will create a large number of pastures that will compete with grazing lands of the country 3, 4, and 5 years from now. Cattlemen are disturbed, and they have reason to be disturbed, about the fact that within 3 or 4 years an additional 6 million or 7 million head of cattle may be in competition with their pastures.

Mr. Chairman, the twin objectives of the soil-bank program—to conserve our land and eliminate price-depressing surpluses—are good. The biggest trouble with this bill is that one of the most important segments of agriculture has been left out. Grasslands or grazing lands should be included in the soil-bank proposal. Therefore, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. If my interpretation of the amendment is correct, it seems to me the amendment is a good one. I wish to read line 6: "Making a corresponding reduction in livestock units below a representative period designated by the Secretary."

Does that mean that if I should put 15 percent of my pasture land into this acreage reserve program that I would be supposed to reduce the number of my cattle by about the same percentage? And I am talking about range cattle.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. Otherwise it would not work, I will advise the gentleman. In other words, it should be in the conservation reserve if we did not do that. This is the way to help cut down the cattle numbers. The surplus in the cattle population is the greatest surplus in agriculture today and the cattle growers are carrying that surplus, not the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman is sure his amendment means if a livestock producer goes into this program, if he should take a 25-percent acreage reserve in the program, he must agree to take a 25-percent reduction?

Mr. ALBERT. He will have to reduce his cattle numbers.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] be allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my wholehearted approval and support of this amendment. I think it fills a void that is present in this bill which will mean more to thousands of small farmers across the country than anything else we can do at this time. I have seen the disastrous results of the fall in cattle prices. I have seen cattle sales where bankrupt small farmers were forced to sell their calves for \$5 or \$6 apiece. This amendment would mean more in terms of improving the economic life of the farmers of our section than anything else, and I want to commend the gentleman for offering the amendment.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DIXON. I am very much in favor of the pending amendment. As I figured here beef when we consider parity is 22 percent below cotton and 15 percent below wheat. Wool is 26 percent below cotton and 19 percent below wheat.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. So far as I am personally concerned, I did not know of the gentleman's amendment or anything about it or that he was going to offer it until it was presented. I would like to ask the gentleman, Did he present this amendment in committee?

Mr. ALBERT. I presented the amendment to the committee, but we had no chance or opportunity to hold hearings on these various amendments because we were trying to bring this bill to the floor. No substantial objection to the amendment was expressed in the committee.

Mr. HALLECK. My information is that by a very substantial vote the committee decided not to include this sort of provision in the bill.

Mr. ALBERT. That is not correct. There was no record vote or showing of hands on this amendment. It was defeated by a voice vote without argument or debate.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation thus far has been largely in favor of that portion of agriculture which provides only about 30 percent of the farm income. This legislation has to a very large extent discriminated against the livestock raiser and the other 70 percent of our agricultural income.

My first reason for supporting the pending amendment is that it will tend to some extent at least to overcome the inequity that exists between the basics and feed grains supported under the bill and the livestock industry. Croplands eligible under this bill only amount to about 8 percent of agricultural income in the State of Utah, 18 percent in Colorado, 16 percent in California, and 16 percent in Oregon, while in our State the livestock

industry accounts for 70 percent of our agricultural income.

Now, our livestock raisers are not asking for supports, but they are asking for some sort of equity; at least that they be not further discriminated against through Federal legislation.

My second reason is that soil conservation is needed just as much on the ranges as it is on our croplands, and in many instances more.

I am just going to illustrate the situation as I see it. The Utah cities are located largely on the Wasatch front, immediately on the hillsides backed by the steep mountains. Private overgrazing and drought account for much trouble with watersheds supplying the cities, when the high mountain slopes and the divides become bare, the snow melts immediately in the spring and runs off as floods. Then, when we want it in the summertime for our cities, we have no water.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON. Our communities have raised nearly \$200,000 to buy private rangelands in order to take them out of grazing so that the Forest Service could reseed and restore them. In those areas the Forest Service has made a great transformation and now, instead of grass, underbrush and trees cover the formerly denuded areas the precious water running off as floods in the spring, when we do not need it, the water seeps in and runs out as springs in July and August when we do need it.

I support this amendment, first, because it will help to overcome further discrimination of farm legislation against livestock and in favor of the so-called basic crops; second, it will reduce the number of livestock on overgrazed areas; third, it will help some livestock men to stand the shock of the reduced number of their livestock while parts of their range is being restored; and, fourth, it will protect our watersheds which threatens the destruction of our cities unless they are protected.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. The majority leader asked a question if this amendment had not been voted down in the committee. Is it not a fact that in the committee there was an agreement that the bill should be brought to the floor as it was, and 5 or 6 or 8 amendments were hastily voted down with very little debate or discussion or anything else, leaving the bill just as it was?

Mr. DIXON. The gentleman is right.

Mr. BELCHER. With the understanding that any amendment may be brought up on the floor.

Mr. DIXON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BELCHER. And that any Member could offer amendments on the floor.

Mr. DIXON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. JENNINGS. Does the gentleman not agree with the fact that if this provision is put in the bill, it will make it more acceptable to the livestock industry throughout the country; that there might be those who could support the soil-bank provision with this amendment in that could not otherwise support the bill?

Mr. DIXON. This is the very minimum of what we ought to do for an industry that is depressed worse than any other and has the greatest surpluses.

Mr. JENNINGS. That is exactly right. May I add further that I think this is a good provision. I support it wholeheartedly, and I trust it will be adopted.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HENDERSON. May I ask the gentleman what effect this amendment will have upon the raisers of cattle, especially in the State of Ohio and States farther to the east? Would it be beneficial to them?

Mr. DIXON. I do not know the situation in Ohio, so I am unable to answer.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would it be beneficial to anyone in any part of the country who was raising livestock exclusively?

Mr. DIXON. It would benefit the livestock raiser; possibly not the livestock feeder but the livestock raiser it certainly would help, because his feeds are going to go up under this bill; unquestionably they will go up, and this is the least we can do to help him.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, in answer to the gentleman from Ohio, is it not a fact that anything that would reduce the cattle population in the United States would certainly improve the conditions that exist in the cattle industry?

Mr. DIXON. This bill would reduce the cattle population of the United States, and it should bring better prices for livestock.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I hesitate to say what I am about to say, but I feel constrained to do it. There may be a lot of merit in this proposition, but it is a far-reaching proposal. It authorizes and directs the Secretary to take this action. It was not worked out, as I understand it, in conference. I do not think it has had the consideration that it ought to have before a matter of this importance goes into the bill. I would not be for foreclosing some such action if the committee could get to work on it and have some hearings and determine what ought to be done about it. But it is a new matter and I think a very great extension of what we have set out to do. I doubt the wisdom of it at this time.

Mr. DIXON. It is not a new matter to me. I have discussed it with the Department and Representative ALBERT with the committee. In my opinion, it is all to the good. The chief reason why it has not been given approval is that they did not want to add to the complex farm bill at this time.

Mr. Chairman, upon very careful examination of the soil-bank provisions of H. R. 10875, I have come to the conclusion that it provides very little direct assistance to farmers in the 10 Western States of Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Colorado, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming, who primarily produce beef cattle, sheep, lambs, and wool. For this reason, I wish to speak in support of the Albert amendment, which includes grazing lands in the acreage reserve.

Indirectly the soil bank may serve to improve the price and income position of midwestern livestock producers if it succeeds in reducing the production of feed grains and thereby the supplies of competing meats such as hogs. The soil bank, as proposed in H. R. 10875, however, does not provide much in the way of direct assistance to the depressed western beef cattle and sheep industry for these reasons:

First, because the acreage reserve program primarily is limited to the basic commodities—wheat, cotton, corn, rice, peanuts, and tobacco, which provide American farmers with only 26 percent of their income. By including feed grains, Utah livestock producers can expect to pay more for feed and feed concentrates since it is already a deficit feed area. Grazing or range land is not eligible, although in the Western States such lands constitute the basis for our production of beef cattle and sheep which, by comparison, provide farmers in these States with up to 80 percent of their income.

Second, the croplands eligible for the acreage reserve are not to any appreciable extent grown in the beef cattle and sheep country of the Western United States. For example, in Utah only 8 percent of cash farm receipts are derived from the sale of basic commodities; in Nevada only 1 percent; in Wyoming only 8 percent; in Colorado only 18 percent; this mostly from wheat grown in the non-livestock-producing areas, and only 16 percent in California and Oregon, respectively.

On the other hand, we find that 41 percent of the cash from receipts in North Dakota are from the sale of basic commodities, 42 percent in Kansas; both of these being major wheat-producing States. In the major tobacco, cotton, rice, and peanut producing States, a high percentage of cash from receipts likewise is derived from their sale. For example, 66 percent is derived from the sale of one or more of these products in North Carolina; 59 percent in South Carolina; 41 percent in Georgia; 46 percent in Kentucky; 42 percent in Tennessee; 45 percent in Alabama; 65 percent in Louisiana; and 41 percent in Oklahoma.

The acreage reserve program, therefore, is primarily a program for pro-

ducers of basic commodities. It is not capable of meeting the price and income problems of the beef cattle and sheep industry of the western United States. Nor for that matter is the conservation reserve program which limits eligible land to that which is regularly in use for the production of row crops and feed grains.

Mr. Chairman, the present price situation faced by the producers of beef cattle, calves, lambs, sheep, and wool is indeed a bleak one. A comparison of market prices as a percentage of the parity price of the products with those of the commodities eligible for the soil bank under H. R. 10875, reveals that the producers of these livestock products are in more desperate straits than those who produce the basic commodities in the Midwest and Southern States.

As of April 15, 1956, the prices of the eligible acreage reserve commodities—cotton, wheat, corn, rice, and tobacco—burley—stood at 92, 85, 76, and 81 percent of parity, respectively. On the other hand, beef cattle, calves, lambs, sheep, and wool were selling, respectively, at 70, 71, 77, 63, and 66 percent of parity. You will note that all of these livestock products were selling at a parity price below the basic commodities eligible for the acreage reserve.

The severity of this price situation in the 10 Western States is revealed by the Crop Reporting Board's Livestock and Poultry Inventory, January 1, which was released on February 1, 1956. Although cattle and calf numbers increased by 409,000 head during 1955, the value of the 17,312,000 head on farms as of January 1, 1956, was only \$1,557,809,000—some \$96,639,000 less than the value of the 16,903,000 head on farms on January 1, 1955. During 1955 the average value per head declined \$7.90.

Sheep numbers declined by 90,000 head during 1955, and the total value of the 13,487,000 on farms as of January 1, 1956, was \$212,721,000—a decline of \$17,542,000 in 1955.

In spite of this, the western beef cattle producers are not asking for direct price supports, but they have a right to complain about a soil-bank proposal which gives, in addition to price supports, other financial assistance to cropland agriculture which provides less than 30 percent of total farm income in the United States, and less than 20 percent in their area. When they receive no price support, they have a right to complain about additional financial favoritism shown supported feeds which are an element of livestock costs.

Mr. Chairman, simply put, the general public interests require that the pressures on these rangelands be eased and our rehabilitation program must be accelerated. Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Peterson has stated our need this way:

These lands must be managed for maximum continuous production of forage and its efficient use for livestock and game production. This means reasonable use for livestock and game production. This means reasonable use—not misuse or nonuse. It means that the way they are grazed should encourage the range forage to continuously renew itself. Where it is below its potential, management should encourage improvement. It

also means full application of seeding, plant control, soil fertilization, and other tools, where such tools have been proven, adopted, and practical.

This amendment, therefore, is designed to facilitate sound range management of our private lands and, at the same time, provide direct assistance to our western livestock producers. Many of these people cannot continue in business in the light of the low prices for beef cattle, sheep, lamb, and wool, and the need for reducing grazing on public and private lands, without some financial assistance. Because of climatic and topographic conditions, other types of agriculture, such as those which exist in these Midwest and southern areas, do not offer much in the way of other production alternatives.

The amendment provides for deferred grazing payments on private lands as part of the acreage-reserve program, since most of these rangelands are in extremely poor condition. The Agricultural Conservation Program Service of the Department of Agriculture, which administers the agricultural conservation program, informs me that such payments as those contemplated by this amendment are being made at present in a few States. Due to lack of funds, however, payments are very modest and far below those needed to induce very extensive participation.

This amendment will serve, therefore, to meet these two problems—one immediate, the other long range:

First, Livestock producers will find in it direct financial assistance similar to that provided producers of the basic commodities who participate in the acreage-reserve program.

Second, A great impetus will be given to proper conservation and management of our public and private range and watershed lands.

I urge the House to adopt this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that practically everybody wishes to do something to help the present farm situation. It is rather difficult to agree on just what would help. I should like to point out some things about the pending amendment. It is my belief that if the Department were to purchase these products and require—which they have not done heretofore—that the price paid be carried back to the original producer so that the farmer got the benefit, doubtless it would do some good.

I do not know but that it would be well to adopt the provision so that they could work it out in conference, but I should like to point out one thing that I see that would lead us in the opposite direction to that which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] contemplates going.

If you cut the cattle population 15 percent, where do they go? They go to market. If you force 15 percent of your cattle on the market in addition to that which is already on the market, without any price support, what have you done?

It might well further reduce cattle prices. It is a serious question.

My purpose here, however, is to point out that unless certain major changes such as advance payments are incorporated into this bill, I plan to vote for the bill largely because I believe in soil conservation and the bill does protect against further cuts in cotton acreage which has been cut 35 percent in 3 years. I wish to warn the membership that unless we continuously keep in world markets that we could be making the most serious mistake a Congress could ever make. We should have learned we cannot bring world supply and demand into balance by cutting our production.

You cannot prevent world production working on the American farmer. Neither can you control production just by cutting acreage. Let us look at the records of the Department. Since 1932 the Department of Agriculture has cut cotton acreage 35 percent. In 1955, 55,000 farm families were put out of their homes by cotton acreage reduction alone.

What happened in the Commodity Credit Corporation during that period? The inventory of the Department of Agriculture, the Commodity Credit Corporation, in cotton increased from \$32,500,000 in 1952 to \$1,437,000,000 investment as of now, as I have pointed out, during the period that we had a 35 percent reduction in acreage in the United States.

Let us take wheat. The Department of Agriculture has cut wheat acreage 25 percent in the last 3 years, and the inventory of the CCC in the same period has increased from \$352 million to \$2,399,000,000.

The point I wish to make is this: The only way we in this country can live with this soil bank, under which we pay the farmer to further cut his acreage, is for this Government continually to keep our supply of commodities on world markets for sale; because we have held our commodities off world markets and refused to sell them on a competitive basis.

This 35 percent cut in cotton acreage in the United States has not cut world supply. It has meant that 35 percent of our acreage moved into South and Central American and north Africa. This 25-percent cut in United States wheat acreage has not cut world acreage in wheat. It has moved overseas—because by Government policy United States commodities were not offered in world markets at truly competitive prices.

In this bill we are paying rent to the American farmer further to cut his acreage, which is all right, if we will see that the supply of cotton, of wheat, and other commodities we have on hand is put on the counters of the world for sale on a competitive basis to take away the incentive of people in foreign countries to increase their wheat acreage as we reduce ours.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I should like to ask the gentleman if he does not know that the Secretary of Agriculture has full and

complete authority to do everything the gentleman is urging him now to do?

Mr. WHITTEN. I agree thoroughly with the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. And when the gentleman last year tried to get the Secretary to announce a positive export program for cotton, he refused to do it. When he finally got around to it in January, he moved about 1 million bales of cotton in about 40 days.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is exactly right. I have made this speech so many times I irritate some of my colleagues, I am sure, but I should like to point out that in 1954, after I had urged for years that these commodities be offered for sale, for the first time we got some limited number of commodities offered in world trade on a competitive basis, and they sold for dollars. This year, as pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the Secretary finally got around to offering 1 million of the shortest-staple cotton we had, hoping to sell it in a year, and he sold it in less than 60 days. Only yesterday did they get around to opening the bids on the sale of any more cotton.

I would point out to you the record: Last year my subcommittee pointed out that the Department had unlimited authority to sell CCC farm commodities in world trade at any competitive price essential to move them.

We pointed out that this then \$10 billion corporation had no sales manager or sales organization.

We pointed out that the Department had insufficient information on expanded foreign production and on what foreign countries were doing to export their commodities.

We pointed out that our information as to where the money between the farmer and the consumer, the spread, was going was entirely inadequate.

Our committee set up funds separately for those purposes only. The Secretary said in the press our report was politics, yet the House passed our bill without amendment.

The Secretary went to the Senate and had these provisions stricken from the bill.

We went to conference with the Senate and such provisions were put back in the bill and all conferees signed the report, House Members and Senators, Republicans and Democrats.

In recent months I note where the Department and even President Eisenhower is proud of what the Department is doing under these provisions.

Acreage cuts
(In millions)

	July 1952	July 1955
Cotton.....	27.1	17.5
Corn.....	82.4	81.6
Wheat.....	78.3	58.3

* 35 percent.
* 25 percent.

CCC INVENTORIES

In reviewing the various developments in our agricultural situation, during the 3 years Mr. Benson has served as Secretary, we should take a look at the

number and value of commodities in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation. As of December 31, 1952, when he took over control of the Department, CCC inventories totaled a little over \$1 billion. As of December 31, 1955, these holdings had increased to over \$6 billion. As to specific commodities, the record is as follows:

(In millions)

	Dec. 31, 1952	Dec. 31, 1955
Corn.....	\$447.0	\$1,300.0
Cotton, upland.....	32.5	1,437.0
Rice.....	2	175.9
Wheat.....	352.4	2,399.0
Dairy products.....	8.4	281.3
Nonbasics.....	198.9	270.7

You will recall that for 3 years I have pointed out that the Department had authority to sell these commodities in world trade through normal channels for dollars. Until 1954 the Department would not offer any commodities. At that time the Department offered 137 million pounds of peanuts; 369 million pounds of cottonseed oil; 70 million pounds of linseed oil, 9 million pounds of flaxseed; and small quantities of several other commodities, and you sold them for dollars. The amount sold for dollars in 1954 was \$92,914,102. In 1955 you finally added limited amounts of butter, dried milk, whey, corn, rice, wheat, barley, grain sorghums, oats, rye, and soybeans, and sold them for dollars.

During this period our Government refused to offer cotton in world trade for sale for dollars at competitive prices, resulting in the biggest holdings of cotton ever held off the market by any country in history, reaching the total of 8 million bales.

Only on January 1, 1956, would the Secretary offer any cotton and then you said you would offer only 1 million bales of the shortest staple, $\frac{3}{8}$ inch. I am pleased to note our experience apparently proves the soundness of my views, for in the month of January 1956 you sold 600,000 bales of the total 1 million you announced you would sell in 6 months; and on the 28th day of February, in 59 days, you had sold the last bale of the million offered.

During this 3 years the Department held United States commodities, with the exceptions mentioned. Thousands of farm families were put off the farms and out of homes, 55,000 by your cotton acreage reductions in 1955 alone; and foreign acreage increased as fast as our farmers were cut back.

While our commodities were held off world markets by refusing to sell competitively and cut our farmers' acreage, foreign production, under the Department's convenient price umbrella increased as follows:

INCREASED FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

During the 4-year period ending with the crop year 1954-55 foreign countries increased production of all the basic commodities—cotton, wheat, corn, rice, tobacco, and peanuts—over 1950-51 levels.

Based on the most recent information available for the crop year 1954-55 the

increase was approximately as follows: Cotton, 5.1 million bales, 28 percent; wheat, 329 million bushels, 6 percent; corn, 403 million bushels, 19 percent; rice, 29 billion pounds, 13 percent; tobacco, 457 million pounds, 9 percent; and peanuts, 1,360,000 tons, 14 percent. These increases are substantial but the increase of 28 percent in cotton production is particularly significant when it is realized that United States production declined 16 percent from almost 16.5 million bales in 1953-54 to an estimated 13.9 million bales in 1955-56.

While it is impossible at this time to forecast the world's 1955-56 crops, such information as is available indicates a further substantial increase over 1954-55 on at least two of the major basic commodities—cotton and wheat—possibly as much as 1.5 million bales on cotton—6 percent—and 440 million bushels on wheat—7 percent.

Land devoted to production of these two commodities in 1955-56 is expected to be substantially more than in 1945-55, nearly 2 million acres on cotton and 15 million acres on wheat, in addition to an increase in 1954-55 over 1950-51 levels of almost 10 million acres on cotton and 46 million acres on wheat.

Corn: Foreign production up 403,500,000 bushels.

Dairy products: Foreign countries produced 740 million pounds more cheese, 66 million more dried milk.

In 1954 United States exports of cheese dropped from 47.5 million pounds to 5.4 million pounds.

Canned milk: United States dropped out, and the Netherlands increased exports 125 million pounds above 1950.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WHITTEN was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Earlier in this week Secretary of Agriculture Benson gave me flat assurances in testimony before my committee that the Government now was going into a sales program and that we could rely on their carrying forward a sales program to sell these commodities and keep them constantly offered for sale. If that is done, we can live with the soil-bank idea, but if it is not done it will just further move our acreage overseas.

The reason I am disturbed today is that the Department opened bids yesterday for further cotton sales, and they had bids for 1 million bales more of cotton. The lowest price offered, so I am told, was 27.5 cents for the shortest kind of cotton they have, very, very little below the support level we have in this country. Do you think the Department sold that many bales? They accepted bids on only 10,000 bales, though they had the bids there, bona fide bids, for 1 million bales of cotton. After what happened yesterday, I am skeptical. I have invited the Secretary and the Department witnesses to come back before my committee tomorrow so that we can dig into it.

I wish to point out that as we have cut cotton acreage under a compulsory law, that acreage has shown up overseas. As we have cut wheat acreage, that acreage

has shown up overseas. As we have cut these other acreages, they have shown up overseas. These foreign countries are increasing as rapidly as we cut down.

There is only one way in the world that I can see that our reductions where we contribute our part in trying to bring world supply and demand into balance can be made effective, and that is to keep our commodities constantly on the tables of the world, the counters, for sale at competitive prices.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. If we go into an extensive program of subsidizing the sale of our surplus cotton abroad, it is going to take considerable financing to put on a program of that kind.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I interrupt the gentleman, because I differ with his statement so radically.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me continue my question, please. Suppose we approve OTC, there is a provision in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade against the setting up of subsidies and import quotas. Would we have to go to Geneva and submit our request there to 34 other nations? Certainly there will be other nations that grow wheat. Are they going to give us permission under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to set up a subsidy to dispose of our surplus?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am in agreement with the gentleman on that issue, so there is no argument with me on that. The Government already owns these commodities and is paying storage on them at the rate of about a million dollars a day. If you go ahead and sell these commodities you could save that amount in storage and we would make it possible for our farmers to farm. Every country in the world is moving the commodities they have in world trade for what they will bring. The only way we can keep from ending up as producers for domestic consumption only is to keep the commodities our farmers are producing offered in world trade for what they will bring. This bill is highly dangerous unless the Secretary does as he has assured us he will do and as he has proven in the last year and a half he can do, that is, sell these commodities in world trade.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. The gentleman has indicated that the Secretary should sell this cotton in world trade. Is there anything to prevent the producers themselves from selling it in world trade?

Mr. WHITTEN. The mechanics of this program have the effect of preventing it, because if you can get 82.5 percent support in the United States, under the President's pronouncement, or 90 percent under the present law, if the world price is below that you can easily see the farmers would go to the Commodity Credit Corporation and get the loan, as long as the world price is below the United States domestic support price.

The mechanics of the program, under present conditions would be that the cotton would go into the Commodity Credit Corporation and out just because that would be of economic benefit to the farmers. Now, you can change this method of handling the thing under the present law, but that would be the process.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to point out that just a few years ago when we had a cotton embargo imposed upon us, cotton was selling in the world market far higher than it was selling here at home.

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes. As you will recall, the world market was around 76 cents a pound and our production was all bottled up in the United States where the farmer was getting about 45 cents a pound. Fear of an all out war with Korea was given as the reason, but the effect was to injure our farmers.

Mr. COOLEY. We would not let the American farmer sell his cotton abroad.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is exactly it. In effect, by Government we have it bottled up here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to my distinguished friend from Tennessee whom I greatly admire that I have been here a half hour waiting to be recognized, also to say to the House that I understood this proposed legislation had been amicably agreed upon and that all differences had been reconciled and that you were going to come out here with a bill that we would experience no difficulty in passing and which would be acceptable to most of the Members on both sides of the aisle. I understood all differences had been ironed out. But, it is quite evident now that the doors are going to be opened and the bars are going to be let down and that you are going to clutter up this proposed legislation with a lot of amendments which will not make it any more acceptable than the previous bill which was vetoed by the President. Take cattle grazing, for instance. If this amendment as agreed to—the doors have been opened again. Now I cannot understand why, if cattle production was at a low level in 1949, it should have increased so tremendously through the years up to 1956. Evidently the cattle were not shipped to the market. If the cattle had been shipped the law of supply and demand would have stabilized the market and cut down the production. The American people might have gotten cheaper beef. However, the consumer has no voice here, he merely pays the bill. I would not mind if there were some restrictions in this amendment to help the small cattle farmers. I am in deep sympathy with and want to help the small farmer, but I am not interested in helping these gentlemen farmers, these professional businessmen who went into the cattle business, and these drug-

store cowboys who saw a good market in 1949, and who all went into the cattle business thinking they were going to get rich quick. It is the same as an individual who went into the market and bought some stock. If it goes down he takes his loss and has no one to bail him out; he takes his loss and that is that. These folks that went into the cattle business overproduced and then they ran into a drought and then they ran into a depressed market and a couple of years ago they came up here asking for Uncle Sam to bail them out. Now, they are in the cattle business which is outside of their particular profession and with more cattle than the market can absorb they are in difficulties and they are looking for relief. I want to help the old, established cattle farmer, the cattle rancher who has been in the cattle business all his life and the small cattle farmer. But, these folks who went into the cattle business in a big way, who saw a rainbow in the sky and who then ran into a bad market, a drought, overproduction, and a few other things, think now that here is a good chance to get bailed out of a bad situation. I would like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma if the situation is so bad and if there is such a depressed market, why have cattle increased so tremendously since 1949?

Mr. ALBERT. The increase in cattle has not been paralleled by the price situation, obviously. The number of cattle has been going up as the price has been going down because there is no place to go with the cattle.

Mr. GAVIN. Certainly, that is natural, put them on the market even though the price is lower they will be readily taken up and they will proceed with more caution in overproducing in the future.

Mr. ALBERT. This particular program would require a decrease in cattle in order for them to participate in it.

Mr. GAVIN. Naturally, ship the increased production to the market, supply and demand will stabilize the market and if these people cannot make a profit a lot of them in the cattle business who were not cattle farmers will go out of business and you will have no more overproduction. Now you have an overproduction of cattle and you are coming along asking the Congress to pass legislation to bail them out. You say, let us get some help for the cattle farmer. Let the doors be opened so that he can recover some of his anticipated losses that he will have to take sooner or later. If they had better judgment, they would not have gone into the cattle business in the first place, it was out of their line. They should have stayed out of the cattle business and looked after their business. If he was a gentleman farmer or a professional businessman let him take his loss and not be asking for legislation for relief. But here are these drugstore cowboys who thought they were going to make a big killing in the cattle business and who now are asking us here to open the door with legislation to recoup his losses.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman spoke of amendments that might be considered. I would like to say that as far as I am concerned—and I have tried to be as diligent as I could in connection with this matter—I have taken the position that we should not have a lot of amendments in connection with this bill that has been worked out after a great deal of time and effort devoted to it. I do not know what the effect of this amendment could be. It might be destructive to the entire bill. I would like to say further that a number of Members have come to me with amendments that were presented in the committee, and my advice to them has been that we ought to go on and perfect this bill and get it passed, because essentially it is a good bill that we could support. If the door is to be open to all sorts of amendments, and many of them were offered in committee, there is no telling what effect it will have on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GAVIN was granted 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. HALLECK. My position has been that this legislation containing all the good things that it does contain should be passed and become law. I do not want a lot of amendments put in here that will jeopardize it.

Mr. GAVIN. I understand the gentleman, and I concur if it is cluttered up with a lot of unworkable amendments it will be of no use. If you are going to have a lot of amendments here today, you are going to muddy up this bill.

While I am on my feet, I want to say I am sincerely, earnestly, and greatly interested to help the small farmer. I heard the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] this morning talk about corn. He said the corn farmer can grow an unlimited number of acres of corn if he uses it for his own use on his own farm. I wondered why the Committee on Agriculture made an exception with reference to wheat, because the small farmer cannot do that with wheat. He is restricted even though he is growing it for his own use. That is the little farmer that I spoke about the other day, who wanted to be let alone, did not want to be regimented restricted and regulated. I heard the gentleman from Minnesota say that the corn farmer would be restricted and regimented. I was surprised. This little fellow I was talking about grew a few too many acres of wheat and the Government moved in on him. There were 767 of them in my great State of Pennsylvania. Why did you make an exception to allow the corn farmer to grow all the corn he wanted, but the little wheat farmer had to be restricted to 15 acres? Why did you put the little wheat farmer where he could not grow 50 or 75 acres or enough for his own use without getting the Government on his back?

Mr. HOPE. Does the gentleman wish me to reply to his question?

Mr. GAVIN. I do.

Mr. HOPE. Of course, this all goes back to 1938. At that time we enacted

the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and different provisions prevailed with respect to wheat than with respect to corn. In the first place, wheat is under marketing quotas, and at a time when there is an oversupply of wheat the law provides the Secretary may put marketing quotas into effect subject to their being approved by the producers. The wheat producers of this country, by more than a two-thirds vote, have approved marketing quotas for the 1956 crop, so they are now in effect. No producer who produces more than his acreage allotment can market to exceed that amount except when his acreage allotment is less than 15 acres. Then there is an exception made in his case. He can produce and market up to 15 acres.

Mr. GAVIN. That is right.

Mr. HOPE. That does not apply to corn; there are no marketing quotas on corn under the law.

Mr. GAVIN. But the gentleman will agree that an injustice has been done to the small wheat farmer, and if it has been in effect since 1938 it is about time you changed it and gave him a little relief to grow what he wants for his own use without the fear of having the Government move in on him.

As far as the cattle farmer is concerned, if you want to bail him out, all right, but everybody else is going to expect to be bailed out, too, and the result will be an unsatisfactory piece of legislation.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana made a very strong plea here for no amendments and to get the bill through. I want him to know that we on this side of the aisle in the committee did our very best to bring this bill out under those conditions, to get members of the committee on that side to go through and support the bill exactly as first proposed. But then they came along with this gimmick, a political gimmick, to advance payments to the farmers. That will open up the bill and I do not know where it is going if you still insist on making it a political football.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. As I get it, this political gimmick the gentleman is talking about is a device to pay farmers this year for what they promise to do next year, but which the administration did not want them to do last year.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. That is the point exactly.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. When the Democrats were in power if we had tried to do anything like that we would have been charged with buying votes, but under this administration the newspapers take the position that it is statesmanship of the highest order. It is rather difficult for a Democrat to become a statesman, let alone a newspaper hero. The newspapers come along now and say this is a heroic thing for the administration to do.

I do not want to disturb my friend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK],

over there when it looks like he is about to become a hero, but I may just decide to join you to become somewhat of a minor league hero myself.

Mr. HALLECK. We will try to welcome you in.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. And that would seem to justify the observation that Mr. Benson is still maintaining his position. There has been a good deal of talk in this administration about principles and things of that sort. Mr. Benson was for flexible supports, but rigid principles. I have, however, about come to the conclusion that what he now wants is flexible principles but rigid supports.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise to speak in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take the full 5 minutes. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] who preceded me mentioned something about people who want to be left alone. That is what the livestock producers of this country have consistently wanted, just to be left alone. The trouble is they have not been left alone under price supports and acreage restrictions. Acreage has been diverted from the production of basic crops to the production of livestock. As acreage restrictions have been applied, the numbers of livestock have consistently increased. The fact is that since 1953 when acreage restrictions went into effect on the major basic commodities, acreage diverted to the production of feed grains, exclusive of corn, has gone up about 24 percent, or about 15 million acres.

With the price-support and acreage-control provisions of this bill as to feed grains, exclusive of corn, I can see that it is going to put a further squeeze on the livestock producers, because we are threatening them with subsidized competition from an additional 15 million acres. I join with the gentleman from Oklahoma and congratulate him for offering the amendment, because it is possibly getting down to the ultimate so that we will actually take land out of production instead of just placing it in competition with another segment of our agricultural economy. If that is what the taxpayers want to do, we should get to it in the first instance and not have to pay the bill 3 or 4 times as the land goes from the production of a basic commodity into the production of feed grain, then into the production of something else, and ultimately into the production of livestock.

I am not at all certain that this proposal is a solution to the problem, but at least it provides for a study of a possible solution.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Can the gentleman tell me whether the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma, which we are discussing, would affect those lands which are public lands and have been leased for grazing purposes, for private grazing?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I do not think it would affect the public lands.

It would affect only the base lands that are the private lands.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. In other words, if a feeder or a cattle grower has leased public lands for grazing purposes and agrees to take part of those public lands out of production in accordance with the amendment, will he receive payments under this amendment?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I do not believe he would as to the public lands under this amendment. That has to be worked out. Here is the way it might be worked out. In his base acreage—that is on his private land where he runs his cattle 9 months out of the year—he would take so many acres out which would have so many animal units carrying capacity on an annual basis. Those would be the only animal units on which he would be reimbursed. There would be no payments on additional animal units computed on the carrying capacity of the public land. Is that correct?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman has correctly stated the situation.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I sincerely hope that the House will support and pass the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma. If there is anything to be worked out later, there is plenty of time to do it in the other body or in conference. It may be this is not the solution, but it is deserving of this consideration.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma because I am sure that the amendment will help some small farmers get into this program that will not be able to get into it in any other way.

The small, diversified farmer who has meadows or pasture lands he has seeded himself, that he has been using for hay or grazing, can, according to the terms of the bill that came from the committee, retire a portion of that land into the conservation reserve. But if he is located in a country like that of the gentleman from Oklahoma, and God sowed that grass and the farmer is in the cattle-grazing and producing business, he is barred from retiring that kind of land into the conservation soil bank. He

does not have to count the heads of cattle he is running on this land.

If I have a pasture, I am usually overgrazing it or have all the cattle on it that it will maintain. If I rent 15 or 20 or 100 or 200 acres of my grazing land to the Federal Government, I will automatically be forced to cut down the number of cattle I produce. If I undertake to keep them on the restricted acreage they will starve to death or have to be sold as canners, which will require me to reduce my cattle number. If I rent the Federal Government a certain amount of acreage of my pasture land and neither graze it or use it for hay, and if I put it in the soil-conservation reserve, that automatically reduces the amount of beef or milk I can produce on my land. That does not have to be provided for. It comes about automatically.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good amendment, and I hope it will prevail.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], relating to the inclusion of grasslands in this program. I think the gentleman from Oklahoma has studied this out thoroughly. I know both he and I discussed it with a couple of ranchers from Oklahoma, including Mr. Harold Davis, who now lives in his district and who formerly came from mine.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak with reference to another matter. I should like to read a report I received today from the Department of Agriculture as to the surpluses we now have:

APRIL 30, 1956.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WICKERSHAM: This refers to your letter of April 14, 1956, in which you requested that the table you enclosed, "How Long Would Supply of Government Surplus Food Last?", be brought up to date.

There is enclosed a copy of the data in table form that has been revised as requested. The quantities reflected under loan and also owned by Commodity Credit Corporation under the price-support program are as of February 29, 1956, which is the latest date the information is available.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN L. McLAIN,
Assistant Secretary.

U. S. Department of Agriculture, Commodity Credit Corporation

Quantity of certain commodities pledged for loans and commodities in price support inventory as of Feb. 29, 1956					Estimated domestic disappearance plus gross exports for market year, 1956-57	Months and days CCC stock would last, based on 1956 requirements (assuming no 1956 production and no private stocks)	
Commodity	Unit of measure	Pledged for loans	Owned by CCC	Total quantity		Months	Days
Corn	Bushels	Thousands 369,826	Thousands 744,619	Thousands 1,114,445	Thousands 3,100,000	4	11
Cotton, upland	Bales	6,582	14,771	21,353	12,800	13	4
Rice	Hundredweight	15,212	84,271	99,483	55,200	6	19
Wheat	Bushels	273,271	846,271	1,119,542	925,000	14	23
Butter	Pounds	114,107	309,819	423,926	1,350,000	2	24
Cheese	do.	119,264	119,264	238,528	1,300,000	1	4
Milk, dried, nonfat	do.	79,272	24,696	103,968	405,000	3	1
Barley	Bushels	56,716	17,942	74,658	235,000	3	26
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	58,533	32,032	90,565	1,525,000	22	22
Oats	Bushels	10,988	1,132	12,120	81,000	4	23
Rye	do.						

¹ Figures from Commodity Credit Corporation Report of Financial Condition and Operations as of Feb. 29, 1956.

Mr. Chairman, at this point, I should like to read into the Record a table which has been supplied to me today by the Commodity Credit Corporation of the Department of Agriculture. This table sets forth the months and days CCC stocks would last, based on 1956 requirements, and assuming that there would be no further 1956 production and no private stocks.

The story this table tells is alarming.

Our surplus production of farm crops is much smaller than most of us have been led to believe.

To take three staple farm products as instances: CCC has enough oats to meet consumption demands for only 22 days; enough butter for 26 days; and enough dried, nonfat milk for a little over 1 month.

This, my friends, was the situation at the close of operations of CCC on February 29, 1956.

What does this table—these incontestable facts—mean to you, to me, and to the people we serve in the House of Representatives?

To me, the meaning is clear. Surpluses are not liabilities; they are assets. The problem for us is not how to get rid of them; but, the problem is how may we best use them.

God, in His infinite wisdom, is taking a great part of that problem out of our hands. A United Press dispatch on April 13, 1956, has this to say:

The Census Bureau estimates that the total United States population, including Armed Forces overseas, was about 167,181,000 on March 1.

This represents an increase of 16,049,000 or 10.6 percent since the last census April 1, 1950. It is a rise of 2,814,000, or 1.7 percent, from March 1, 1955.

Mr. Chairman, the implication is obvious. The increase in population of nearly 3 million per year will eat deep into any food surplus which we are fortunate enough to possess.

Nor may we forget that grim nature has a way of curtailing production that is beyond the forecasting ability of any group of men, be they legislators, farm experts, or hardworking dirt farmers. Floods, droughts, dust storms, tornadoes, hail storms, and insect pests may devastate farm crops—sometimes at the very day of harvest.

Then, with more than 167 million people dependent on those same crops for their food, what will become of the much-assailed surpluses?

There is not one among us who does not know of some person—an aged citizen; a fellow American deprived of the right to work by accident or disease; an Indian, a ward of our Government—who, if not actually starving, is in need of more wholesome food. These people, who, through no fault of their own, are not eating enough for their physical well-being should be fed from the surpluses which we now have on hand. That would further cut down on the existing CCC stock.

In the present unsettled condition of the world we must always look to the familiar Boy Scout motto and "Be Prepared." Who knows what disaster may strike our friends and allies overseas?

Famine may stalk in India. The Netherlands may again be flooded. As a Christian nation we have always stood ready to be a friend in need. We could trade off much of the so-called surplus for strategic materials or items of value. Nor may we forget the threat of war. My heartfelt prayer is that war will never again take the lives of American youths and destroy our hard-won resources. But—if it does come—our farm surpluses will vanish overnight, like snow before the sun.

Last—but not least—the farmer, himself, must be considered. Removing land from gainful production is driving farmers who have the know-how away from the land. If controls are necessary at all, they should not be so severe as to deprive us of this important segment of our population. Certainly, the family farm is the cornerstone of our agriculture production. The least we can do is to give the farmers with the larger families to support additional producing acreage to support them.

Mr. Chairman, more than 4,000 years ago, a great man visualized the problem of surpluses. That great man met the problem of surpluses and solved it.

Permit me to quote a few verses from the Bible. It is the 41st chapter of Genesis, beginning with the 25th verse. Joseph is interpreting the Pharaoh's dream.

And Joseph said unto Pharaoh, The dream of Pharaoh is one: God hath shewed Pharaoh what he is about to do.

The 7 good kine are 7 years; and the 7 good ears are 7 years: the dream is one.

And the 7 thin and ill-favored kine that came up after them are 7 years; and the 7 empty ears blasted with the east wind shall be 7 years of famine.

This is the thing which I have spoken unto Pharaoh: What God is about to do he sheweth unto Pharaoh.

Behold, there come 7 years of great plenty throughout all the land of Egypt:

And there shall arise after them 7 years of famine; and all the plenty shall be forgotten in the land of Egypt; and the famine shall consume the land;

And the plenty shall not be known in the land by reason of that famine following; for it shall be very grievous.

And for that the dream was doubled unto Pharaoh twice; it is because the thing is established by God, and God will shortly bring it to pass.

Now therefore let Pharaoh look out a man discreet and wise, and set him over the land of Egypt.

Let Pharaoh do this, and let him appoint officers over the land, and take up the fifth part of the land of Egypt in the 7 plenteous years.

And let them gather all the food of those good years that come, and lay up corn under the hand of Pharaoh, and let them keep food in the cities.

And that food shall be for store to the land against the 7 years of famine, which shall be in the land of Egypt; that the land perish not through the famine.

Mr. Chairman, the table from the Department of Agriculture which I have recently presented to you shows, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the concept of a topheavy surplus of farm crops is an entirely imaginary concept.

The problem before us is—and it will continue to be—not "How shall we get rid of the surpluses we have?" but "How

can we best use these surpluses for the advantage of America and the enduring benefit of mankind?"

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Albert amendment which could include grazing land in the soil-bank plan. If there is to be a soil-bank plan, it is only proper and right that range land should be included.

That is particularly true in the drought-stricken areas of the country. That includes millions of acres which have been scorched by years of dry weather and which are vulnerable to heavy rains and floods. It is of the highest importance that the top soil be preserved as much as possible, and that can only be accomplished if the land is permitted to be idle, or at least have the grazing reduced substantially.

Moreover, we have an overproduction of cattle in this country and, therefore, the inclusion of grazing land in the soil bank can serve the double purpose of restriction to production of cattle and, at the same time, helping preserve the soil and enable the restoration of grass and other vegetation when the rain does come. There can be no program for soil conservation in the ranch country that will contribute more at this time to sound soil conservation than deferred grazing. I earnestly hope the amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALLECK) there were—ayes 103, noes 66.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY: Page 11, line 17, strike out all of lines 17 through 21 and insert:

"(b) Compensation shall be paid to any producer for participating in the acreage reserve program for any year including 1956 when the Secretary has ascertained that such producer has complied with the acreage reduction requirements of such program for such year."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think this is perhaps the most important section which will be in issue here today. The section that I am seeking to amend or change was written in conference. It seems to me that every Member of this Congress owes the people whom he represents the duty to guard the taxpayers' money.

It was originally suggested that we should give to the Secretary \$1.2 billion without any restrictions or limitations and permit him to use that fund just as he determined it should be used. Immediately, as I am sure most of the Members know, it was referred to as a slush fund, that the Secretary would use it for political purposes. And a lot of other things were said. So in conference, the 5 House Members and the 5 Senators sat down to consider the matter and to write into this bill some safeguards. We concluded that the section that appears in the bill now before us was then and there acceptable. It provided that the Secretary should not pay farmers until

the Secretary had determined that the farmers had kept faith with the terms of the contract. It seemed to us that that was a reasonable requirement.

The language in the bill itself provides that no compensation shall be paid to any producer until the Secretary has ascertained that such producer has complied with the acreage reduction requirements of such program for such year.

What I propose to do by my amendment is to change that section so as to read this way:

Compensation shall be paid to any producer for participating in the acreage-reserve program for any year including 1956 when the Secretary has ascertained that such producer has complied with the acreage-reduction requirements of such program for such year.

It might appear that that is a very slight change, but it occurs to me that that is a very important change. I believe that we are now actually faced with this situation.

Are we going to have a soil-bank program in 1956 or not? The Secretary of Agriculture has finally accepted the idea of a soil-bank program. He tried to impress its importance upon the people of America. While some of us have misgivings about the effectiveness of such a program, this program was brought to this House free from all partisan politics. No one can say this bill we now have under consideration is the brain child of a Democrat, nor can he say that it is the brain child of a Republican. This bill represents the hard labor of those of us on the conference and those of us on the committee, and when the roll was called and the final vote was taken in the committee, not a single man in either party voted against the bill we now have here. So we can have satisfaction and be happy in the glad thought that at last we have here a bill that, insofar as the House Committee on Agriculture is concerned, has been stripped of all party considerations.

Are we going to have a soil-bank program this year or not? If you want a soil-bank program this year, if Mr. Benson wants a soil-bank program this year, you should vote for this amendment and you should vote down all substitutes.

Under this proposition, if a cotton farmer wants to retire 10 acres of cotton he can announce it next week, and when cotton-planting time is over, which is only a short time away, he can be checked for compliance. When the Secretary through his agents finds that the man has actually reduced his acreage 10 acres, they give him his marketing card to sell his cotton, and they can give him his soil-bank check right then.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COOLEY was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. COOLEY. That means that the farmer will get these checks in July, August, September, and all through the rest of the year.

I am not willing to admit that the soil-bank program must be postponed until 1957. I am about to believe that

Mr. Benson does not want the soil-bank program to go into operation in 1956. If he does, here is his opportunity to do so.

Down in the far South some crops have been planted, but under this provision farmers can plow up those crops, crops that are now in surplus supply, and if we come in here with this advance payment, this installment-payment proposition, that is only proposing to give to the farmer something this year that you are going to take away from him next year.

Do not believe that the farmers are not intelligent enough to know why that is being done. I think they will ask you and me, "Why didn't you provide a soil-bank program for 1956?" You cannot say to them, "Oh, it was too late. The Committee on Agriculture dragged its feet and did not bring the bill to us in time." Then they will come back to you and tell you your Secretary did not present the bill until the 27th day of February 1956, and even up to now not a single Republican in this House has been willing to become the author of that bill nor to adopt the baby and to take it to his breast and claim it as his own. That is the kind of Secretary that we have. He is still a millstone around your neck and you know it. Now is the time for you to say to him you are the elected Members of the legislative branch of this Government and that you have your responsibility as some of you on your side of the aisle have done.

I have seen great demonstrations of courage in this House during the time I have been here. There are some members of my committee who have grown in stature and power and influence here because they have stood up for their people in their home districts. Here is the soil bank—you propose to give them a partial payment. I am proposing to give them full payment and to give it to them this year—right now—not next January, February or March. If this proposition that I am submitting to this House does not do what I say it will do, I challenge anybody to prove wherein I am wrong. Whoever heard of coming up here proposing to pay a man half of what he is going to earn or what he might earn next year and to take away from him by dilatory tactics and unwarranted delay, the right for him to earn the money—and all of it—in the year 1956. In introducing this, I am not prompted by partisan politics. I respect Mr. Benson as a gentleman and I respect his office and the high position that he holds, but I feel the responsibility to the farmers of America. I believe that if you adopt this amendment and defeat these advance payments the other body will probably take the bill just as it is passed here today and will send it on to the White House and leave the matter in the hands of the Secretary to administer. I cannot for the life of me see why the administration or anyone speaking for the administration would advocate the soil bank as it has been advocated, and then when you come face to face with it, you say, "We will put it off until next year, but we will give the farmer half of what he would earn in the year 1957."

I have no interest in this proposition which should not also be your own interest. I congratulate the Republican members of my committee for rising above the passions of partisan politics and standing up like statesmen and voting for something they know is right. There was not a single effort in the committee by any member on either side to play politics. This is no time for petty purposes. This is no time for petty politics. It is the time, I think, that challenges our very finest virtues and patriotism. I ask you to vote for my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOPE as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY: On page 11, line 17, after the word "No", insert "Final."

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to what has been said to you by the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] with respect to his amendment. His amendment is an effort to avoid voting upon the question of whether or not there will be prepayment under this program. If I understood him correctly, he would have you believe that unless his amendment is adopted there is no way that there could be a 1956 soil-bank program. But the adoption of his amendment will have no effect whatsoever upon the question of whether there will be a 1956 program, because the language in the bill itself in section 103, and in other sections, definitely provides for a program for 1956 by saying the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to formulate and carry out an acreage reserve program for 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959 on crops of wheat, cotton, and certain other crops. So that there is no question at all but what the program is authorized for 1956, and the language which has been offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] makes no difference one way or another. But, more than that, let me call your attention to the language on page 4, line 21, which reads:

Reserve acreage of a commodity may include acreage whether or not planted to the production of the 1956 crop of the commodity prior to the announcement of the acreage reserve program for the 1956 crop if the crop thereon, if any, shall be plowed under or otherwise physically incorporated into the soil, or clipped, mowed, or cut to prevent maturing so that the reduction in acreage of the commodity below the acreage allotment occurs within 21 days after the enactment of this title, or by such later date as may be fixed by the Secretary.

What does that mean? That means that in the case of any crop eligible to come under this program, which has already been planted, if we enact this legislation the farmer can plow it up or clip it or mow it or prevent the crop from coming to maturity, and collect his 1956 payments. So you could not ask

for or you could not get any more authority than is already contained in this legislation with respect to payments for 1956.

The purpose of my substitute amendment is preliminary to an amendment which I expect to offer a little later on, as soon as I can be recognized after this amendment is disposed of. My amendment is to subsection (b) on page 11. It inserts the word "final" in the first line so that, as amended, the subsection would read as follows:

No final compensation shall be paid to any producer for participating in the acreage reserve program for any year until the Secretary has ascertained that such producer has complied with the acreage reduction requirements of such program for such year.

If you put that word "final" in there, that will make it in order for me to offer the other amendment later, which will provide for prepayments.

I would like to read the amendment that I intend to offer to provide for prepayments, but I will not discuss it at any great length at this time. The amendment is as follows:

On page 25, line 2, after "116 (a)"—

That is merely a clarifying provision.

Then on line 8, after the end of the section, insert a new subsection, as follows:

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and in order to assist the producer in financing his farming operations, and caring for and improving his farm property, the Secretary may make an advance payment to the producer of not to exceed 50 percent of the compensation which would become due the producer under his contract to participate in the acreage reserve program; and may in any year make an advance payment to the producer of not to exceed 50 percent of the annual payment for such year which would become due the producer under his contract to participate in the conservation reserve program.

An effort has been made here to lead you to believe that this is purely a political provision with the design of paying out money without any insurance that the program will be carried out or that the soil-bank program will go into operation. Let me call your attention to the fact that practically anyone who goes into the soil-bank program is going to be put to some initial expense. If a man goes into the conservation reserve he is going to be required to plant legumes or soil-building crops, or plant trees, or carry out some operation which would require him to cultivate the soil, purchase seed, fertilizer possibly, and in addition to that in all probability would be required to build fences, because he cannot permit this land to be grazed; he will have to fence it out of his other farm operations.

Is there anything wrong after a man has signed a contract in permitting him to receive a payment which will compensate him for at least part of those expenses he will incur before it is possible for him to receive full payment?

It is necessary in a situation of that kind for the farmer to spend money. He may have it; if he does he probably will not make application for advance payment. He may be able to borrow it, and

in that case he may not make application for advance payment, but why should he pay interest if he is entitled to an advance payment after he signs the contract; and, of course, he cannot receive any advance payment until he does sign a contract.

That is certainly not an unusual situation as far as ordinary business transactions are concerned. Many business contracts have a provision for a first payment when the contract is signed.

It may be felt that perhaps the Government is in danger of losing some of the payments that may be made, but the experience of the Government so far has not indicated that, and there are ways by which the Federal Government can collect from the farmers themselves even without a suit in many cases if they have been paid and do not follow it up with performance. That recourse is found under those provisions of law which allow the Government to offset any indebtedness which the farmer owes the Government, and in most cases since the farmers who go into this program are producers of the basic crops they will be farmers who have the right to obtain loans. They will have the right to ACP payments, and in most cases there will be ample opportunity in my opinion for the Government to offset any losses, should any occur. I do not expect that many will occur, because I do not think many farmers would sign a contract and not go ahead and carry it out; nor do I believe there are many Members of the House who believe that these defaults will happen.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask my friend from Kansas what objection he has to the amendment I offered which makes it perfectly clear that we intend that the Secretary shall pay to the producers for participating in the program in 1956, if indeed they do participate and comply? I would like for the gentleman to say whether or not he sees anything bad about this proposition. If the gentleman is correct in saying that the Secretary may pay under the soil-bank program in 1956, this only provides that he shall do it and shall pay the money after the producer has complied with the reduction in acreage stipulated in his contract.

I know that the gentleman's amendment goes further and will make my amendment ineffective, if adopted. Then the soil bank will be in doubt in the future. We will not know whether it is going to be put in or not. No farmer will be able to say whether he will cooperate with the program. I would like to have an outright vote on the advance or prepayment proposition. If the gentleman could withdraw his amendment now pending and let my amendment be adopted, it would be in the bill in lieu of subsection (b), then we can discuss the merits of the prepayment proposition and that alone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] be allowed to proceed for 6 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. The point I am making in connection with the gentleman's amendment is that it was apparently offered on the theory it is necessary in order to insure a soil-bank program for this year. It is not necessary because there is ample authority in the law right now, not only for farmers who plant crops after this time but for farmers who have planted crops previous to this time. I am sure the gentleman knows that the Secretary of Agriculture is anxious to start this program, the President is anxious to start it, and there is no doubt at all but what it will pass in time permitting the program to go into effect in 1956. It will go into effect; therefore there is no need for the gentleman's amendment. I think my amendment is very necessary and very important so that if we adopt the prepayment provision there will not be a conflict of language in the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. In specific response to the gentleman from North Carolina, I would say there is not anything bad about his amendment. The trouble with his amendment is there is not anything good about it. The substitute offered by the gentleman from Kansas would fit in with the pattern for advance payments that the gentleman contemplates offering. I will demonstrate to the gentleman that his amendment does nothing more than change a few words. If Members have a copy of the bill, it is in the negative. It says:

No compensation shall be paid until there is compliance.

He just simply changes it to the affirmative and says:

Compensation shall be paid when there is proof of compliance.

You use the word "until" in the negative and you use the word "when" in the affirmative. It does not make any difference at all. It does not change the accomplishment of the language in any particular. It is fiction and not fact. It is the difference between tweedle-dee and tweedle-dum. Maybe it is calculated to confuse some people as to its effect, but I do not believe it will confuse anybody. If you will refer to page 11 and look at subsection (b) I think you will have to agree with me that when you say "No compensation shall be paid until" it is no different from saying "Compensation shall be paid when" because both depend on the accomplishment of the acreage-reduction requirement, which is not advance payments. So I say with reference to the gentleman's amendment standing by itself, there is nothing bad about it and there is nothing good about it because it does not change the effect of the language in any single particular.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say I was prompted to offer this amendment by the fact that it has been clearly indicated on the radio that the President in advocating this advance payment program was looking forward to starting the soil bank in 1957. There is not any argument between me and the gentleman from Indiana about the language and the effect of the amendment of mine. There is not any argument between me and my beloved friend from Kansas with regard to the fact that in the bill the Secretary does and will have authority to put the soil bank into operation in 1956. My amendment will say in effect that compensation shall be paid in 1956 if the man complies.

I just want to emphasize the fact that there is no argument between me and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] about the proposition that the soil-bank provision is in the bill regardless of whether my amendment is adopted or not. But, I did want to offer this amendment to make it perfectly clear that the House wanted the Secretary to put it into operation in 1956. Now, if the Secretary cannot put it into operation, I assume that he will say so. My amendment is perfectly harmless, but it will make it clear that we want him to do it if he can and if he does we want the farmers to receive their payments in 1956. Now, that is where we stand.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the committee will adopt the amendment which I have offered as a substitute which, if adopted, will then make it possible without conflict to adopt the provisions of the prepayment amendment that I expect to offer at an appropriate time.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I can point out why it is necessary to put the Cooley amendment in this bill. If you will refer to the bill, you will find that the Cooley amendment relates to section (b) on page 11 and specifically says in positive words that the Secretary shall make payment in 1956 for compliance with the soil bank provisions this year, and that that payment shall be made as soon as compliance is determined. Compliance is ordinarily determined along in July and August. We now have to go through with the procedure of compliance. You cannot now sell your allotted crops until you have shown compliance.

Now, if you will look over on page 25 of the bill, you will find there is another section, section 116, which section has not been amended. The gentleman from Kansas assumed that it was going to be amended sometime in the future, but it has not been amended, and section 116 provides that "Subject to the provisions of section 105," and that is the section to which the Cooley amendment relates. This section 116 provides that the claimant must certify that he has complied not with the acreage requirements but with all requirements for such payment: "That he has complied with all requirements for such payment and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true."

Now, to comply with all of the requirements, you have got to let the full term of the contract expire before making any payments because the contract provides that there shall not be any use of the land during that period of time. Consequently, the Secretary cannot, under the terms of section 116, make payments contemplated in section 105 unless you amend section 105. He can then do it, because section 116 is predicated on section 105 and says "Subject to the provisions of section 105." Consequently, you would require the Cooley amendment in order to make applicable the things in section 116 that the gentleman from Kansas assumed would be taken care of at some future date but which have not been taken care of and are taken care of by the Cooley amendment.

Now, I know the gentleman from New Mexico is asking me to yield and I want to yield to him, but first I want to commend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], because I want to say in all fairness that the gentleman from Oklahoma more than any other Member in this House had to do with the shaping of this proposal, and I think he has offered some very constructive thinking on an important plan.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. It seems to me that the Hope amendment, the one-word amendment we are now discussing, inferentially gives the right to the Secretary to make advance payments even without the subsequent amendment.

Mr. POAGE. Frankly, I do not see anything to the Hope amendment, with all of my high regard for the distinguished colleague from Kansas, except simply, as the gentleman from Indiana says, adding a little further confusion to an already confused situation. I think the whole purpose of it was simply to try to get the thinking of the House away from the importance of the Cooley amendment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the kind remarks the gentleman has made with regard to the small part I had in this particular section. May I ask the gentleman this question? Can you not boil down the difference between the Hope amendment and the Cooley amendment, considering the provisions of this bill as a whole, to this simple fact? If you are for an effective and operating soil bank that will put 100-percent payments into the pockets of the farmers in 1956 you will be for the Cooley amendment and against the Hope substitute.

Mr. POAGE. Exactly. There would never have been any Cooley amendment had there not been a great deal of movement on this side of the aisle suggesting that we had to go and grab some money from next year to pay out before the 6th day of November this year. Had those maneuvers not started nobody

would have supposed that the Secretary was even thinking of not using the authority already in the bill. But after they raised the doubt—and I must say the gentleman did a very excellent piece of work of raising the doubt in the minds of the newspapers and the public of the United States, as to whether the Secretary actually had any authority to do anything this year—after they raised the doubt, there was nothing we could do but try to answer it, we are now simply trying to clear up that doubt.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it has been evident as we have gone along today on what certainly has been something of an explosive issue around here for a number of weeks, if not months, that we have fairly well avoided politics and I think have been operating in good fashion to bring to passage some sound farm legislation.

I do not want by what I say here to do anything that would get this matter into the area or the realm of politics. I think all of us have recognized from the beginning, from the opening of this session in January, that the farm price situation, the cost-price squeeze of the farmer was probably the softest spot in our economy. We recognized that the farmer was not sharing in what for most areas has been a high degree of prosperity. So we wanted to do something about it. And generally speaking, the things we sought to do first involved some relief this year because of the urgency and immediacy of the situation.

Then we sought to deal secondly with what might be described as the long-range parts of the program, with proposals that would attack the fundamental difficulties that beset us. And certainly the soil bank is one of those.

Now I want the amendment of Mr. HOPE to be adopted. I am not supporting it with tongue in cheek. I am for it because I think it will be good for the farmers this year. In contemplation of it, without casting any blame on anyone—some can say the administration was too slow and the Department was too slow, and others might say that Congress was too slow—but I think this plain fact yet remains, that we have progressed so far into the crop year of 1956 that the opportunity is pretty much gone for a farmer to come into the soil-bank plan and get along so far as to establish compliance so that he can be paid under Mr. COOLEY's amendment or the bill as it is written. When that fact became apparent it was suggested, why not then arrange for certain advance payments to be made to the farmer after he enters into his contract and as he begins performance of his contract with the Government?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to have the gentleman explain to me, if he can, how a tenant farmer or a renter from year to year could legally contract with the Government for the retirement

of acreage in the next year, beyond the time of his rental contract, to qualify under this acreage reserve program.

Mr. HALLECK. I take it that if he was not qualified to contract he could not come in under the soil bank anyway. But I am sure he can come in. If he was qualified to contract, that contract becomes binding upon him and likewise upon the Government, and as he performs on that contract he could receive program or advance payments.

This is the simple proposition we are down to, and the adoption of the Cooley amendment does not change it. Do you want to go along with a plan that I say is sound and make possible some advance or progress payments to farmers this year or not? Here is a contract by the Government with the citizen under which the citizen agrees to do certain things. From the time he signs that contract he is obligated to pursue the provisions of the contract, and, as the gentleman from Kansas so well pointed out, immediately in connection with these contracts he is going to begin to spend money in performance of the contract. It is going to cost him money. The amendment that will hereafter be offered by the gentleman from Kansas is simply an effort to tie the advance payments in with the expenditures of money that the farmer will begin to make under his contract with the Government.

Is there anything strange about that? Contractors with the Government start getting paid as their work progresses. The final payment is held up until the whole contract is completed. When the contract is completed they get final payment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HALLECK was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. HALLECK. The subsequent amendment will make it possible for the Government, the farmer having contracted, having entered upon the improvement of his land, with the expenditures necessary to comply with this contract, to say to the farmer, "We shall pay you as you go along an advance payment up to 50 percent. Then, of course, the remaining 50 percent will not be paid to you until you have completed your contract and performed in compliance with your contract as contemplated in the legislation."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is now discussing the next amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HALLECK. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. I was just going to suggest that it might be well if we agree that Mr. HOPE shall by unanimous consent for the moment withdraw this pending amendment so that we can vote on the question the gentleman is now discussing, with the understanding that we shall return to this section if the Hope amendment is adopted. It would

seem to me that would make it so clear. Here is confusion. Let me withdraw my amendment and Mr. HOPE withdraw his amendment, and let the matter be in abeyance until we vote on his prepayment amendment, and then we can come back to this amendment.

I have no love for my amendment. I was offering it in the hope that I might be helpful. I agree with the gentleman that it may be tweedledee and tweedledum that we are raising a lot of rumpus about, anyway.

Mr. HALLECK. I realize that. Actually, may I say to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] I was seeking recognition on the subsequent amendment to be offered at the time the gentleman from North Carolina claimed the floor.

Mr. COOLEY. I had not been advised of that.

Mr. HALLECK. Certainly, as far as I am concerned, I want to expedite the situation, but I think, since we have gone this far with these two amendments, the gentleman's amendment and the substitute, we might as well dispose of them. I do not know whether it is going to make any difference how anyone votes on this subsequent amendment as to what happens here now, but as a matter of orderly procedure, may I say to the gentleman from North Carolina again, and in all humility, I do not think his amendment changes this section one single bit. It just switches it from the negative to the affirmative, and the conditions are still there. It would not enable anybody to get any more money in 1956 than he would get under the language as presently written.

On the other hand, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas as a substitute is the orderly procedure because there should not be a prohibition here against paying a man an advance payment and then subsequently writing in a provision for making an advance payment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say just another thing or two in connection with this whole matter at this time. It should be understood that the amendment subsequently to be offered by the gentleman from Kansas is not merely for 50 percent advance payment on what is done in 1956—it continues as long as the legislation continues. It would provide for advance payments in 1956 as contracts are entered into in 1956 to be finally completed in 1957. It would provide for advance payments in 1957 for contracts to be completed in 1958. It recognizes a continuing responsibility on the part of the Government and certainly a desirability from the standpoint of the individual as against the Government that once he enters into a contract and begins performance and begins paying his money, then the Government in all equity should say to him, "All right, we are going to make percentage payments to you as you go along." There have been several suggestions that this might open the door to widespread fraud on the Government. I have seen enough of farmers and enough of their actions in respect to their obligations to the Government that I am not going to indict the farmers of this country by saying to

them, "We are afraid to trust you with these advance payments. We think you have a right to have them as you begin to spend your money to perform the contract, but we are not going to trust you because we are afraid you will run out on the contract." I do not think the farmers operate that way. Actually and likewise, as the gentleman from Kansas pointed out, we have quite a number of farmers in debt—young GI's who started out. They have obligations to meet. Where are they going to get the money to build the fences to fence in the land that is going to the soil bank? Where are they going to get the money to buy the seed to comply with their contracts? Where are they going to get the money to buy the gasoline to operate the machinery? Mr. Chairman, I just want to make this final statement. The provision offered by the gentleman from Kansas will provide the money that the little farmers—the farmers generally need in the performance of their contract.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest I very sincerely believe that if the House will agree for me to withdraw my amendment and for the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] to withdraw his substitute amendment, then we can then consider the Hope amendment which contemplates prepayments. And, in the event that that amendment is adopted, I think I would have no objection to just abandoning my amendment and accepting Mr. HOPE's amendment.

Here is where we are. We are discussing the very important prepayment proposition which is not even before us at the moment. If we can get this pending amendment out of the way, we can come to the prepayment amendment. We could settle it and then pick this up. I would then have to accept Mr. HOPE's amendment and would withdraw mine. I did not know and I had not been advised that Mr. HOPE intended to introduce this amendment at the time he was on his feet when I was recognized. I do not see how anybody could object to this procedure because it makes it crystal clear what we are doing.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Do I understand that what the gentleman wants to do now is that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] withdraw his substitute amendment and the gentleman from North Carolina will withdraw his amendment?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right. Then the gentleman from Kansas could introduce his prepayment amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Do you see any possibility of misinterpretation in that language which is a prohibition in subsection (b) which says no compensation shall be paid until there is compliance. Obviously, the amendment that Mr. HOPE will offer contemplates payments before the matter of compliance is reached. If his amendment has these words "notwithstanding any other provision of

law"—my only thought about it is that it is just a little awkward to have what would seem to be a prohibition and which I think is a prohibition, and then subsequently provide for an arrangement under which that prohibition would not apply.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman will permit me to proceed for a second—if the prepayment amendment prevails, certainly, I am not going to take advantage of any technical language in the bill. We will correct the bill so as to fully recognize the proposition.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to withdraw my amendment for the time being.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the substitute which I offered to the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, both amendments are withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOPE:

Page 25, line 2, after "116", insert "(a)."

Line 8, after end of section, insert a new subsection as follows:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and in order to assist the producer in financing his farming operations, and caring for and improving his farm property, the Secretary may make an advance payment to the producer of not to exceed 50 percent of the compensation which would become due the producer under his contract to participate in the acreage-reserve program; and may in any year make an advance payment to the producer of not to exceed 50 percent of the annual payment for such year which would become due the producer under his contract to participate in the conservation-reserve program."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, this matter has already been discussed to some extent. I want to take the few minutes I have at my disposal to point out that this amendment does not contemplate a great lot of payments in 1956 on 1957 crops, or anything of that sort. I know the statement has been going around that there will be payments a year in advance, and all that kind of thing. Perhaps it would be possible under this amendment for some farmer who is going to put out a spring crop next year to make an agreement during this year by which he would agree to take some of his acreage out of production in 1957. That might happen. He might want to put legumes in it this fall; he might want to fence it. He might want to plow it. In any event, he would be required to make some commitments and some expenditures for which he certainly would be entitled to be reimbursed if he had signed a contract.

Of course, there will be fall crops planted, such as wheat and winter barley and winter oats. In that event, certainly if the farmer lays out his land, fences it off, and takes it out of production, he is

entitled under those circumstances to receive payments. But it is not out of the way for him to receive advance payments for doing that. Instead of incurring an indebtedness or using funds which he badly needs for other purposes he can have these advance payments.

I have been speaking of the acreage reserve. I think it is even more likely in the case of the conservation reserve that the farmer would find it to his advantage to receive prepayments.

With respect to lands which might go into the conservation reserve a farmer might decide to plant trees this fall. That would require quite an investment not only in the purchase of nursery stock but also in the preparation of the land for that purpose and fencing it as well as other expenses. He might want to plant a legume crop this fall on his conservation reserve, and certainly he would incur a considerable amount of expense before he could possibly be said to have complied so that he could receive a full payment.

There may be certain cases where the farmer wants to carry out conservation practices on his land where there may be several practices necessary and as one is completed there is no reason why he should not receive payment for that practice, and as another is completed he could receive payment for that practice. So there is no reason that I can see why anyone should be fearful; and I am rather surprised that there exists apprehension that these advance payments will be made in anything other than a straightforward way or for other than legitimate purposes.

The fact is if this program should be used in a political way it would defeat that purpose. The farmers of this country are not for sale, and if they get the least idea that a program of this nature is going to be used for political purposes then it would certainly rebound to the discredit of the political party that happened to be in power at that time.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think we will make one of the greatest mistakes we ever made if we really want a soil bank, an effective soil bank in 1956, if we adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

One of the things we are going to do immediately is create a discrimination against a large group of farmers who are farming from year to year, the tenant farmer or the renter renting from year to year. Legally he could not enter into a contract with the Government as to what was going to be done with that land the next year. I call this to the attention of the gentleman from Indiana as a practical matter: If you have a contract for the use of land for 1 year you cannot contract for what is going to be done with that land the following year.

Just what is the answer to that under this advance payment contract I do not know. I do know however that this plan is not fair to the tenant farmer, it is not fair to the renter who has a 1-year contract, and most of our contracts in my part of the country for renters or tenant

farmers are 1-year contracts; and I believe that is so in most sections of the country.

Mr. ARENDS. If the gentleman will yield I may be able to provide him part of the answer. Out in our part of the country the landlord and tenant must enter into agreement as to whether or not they want to go into the soil bank program. If the landlord wants to go into the program, the tenant goes in. If the tenant wants to go in and the landlord does not, neither will go in. It gets down to the proposition that the tenant either wants to farm the land the way the landlord wants it operated or he will look for another farm to rent. Good tenants have no difficulty in reaching agreement with their landlords as to the best thing to do.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further as to that particular point, because the gentleman is stating a situation which is no answer to the argument that the Hope amendment is unfair to the tenant farmer and the renter on a 1-year contract.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I am very much concerned about this particular matter. There are perhaps 100,000 farm tenants in the district that I represent, and this provision would bar them from participation in the program in 1957. We have a provision in the bill before us that requires an equitable sharing as between the tenant and the landlord in any type of soil-bank payments. But tenants never contract beyond 1 year with the landlord for the use of the land. If the landlord gets advance payments he can comply only through the cooperation of the tenant. There is no way in the world to work the thing out where the tenants would get a fair assurance of proper treatment, and there is no way for it to be worked out where the landlord could be assured of having his compliance.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman from Indiana raised a point to the effect that we have progressed so far into the 1956 crop year that the opportunity to comply has passed. That is inconsistent with the statements that have been made on the other side that it will be possible to get the 1956 program going.

This morning I called one of the top agricultural people of the Oklahoma A. and M. College with regard to planting in our section, which is a fairly central part of the United States. He said they are beginning to plant cotton down in the southern part of the State of Oklahoma, that while wheat has been planted there are many wheat farmers who could and would participate in this program by returning a certain portion of the acreage. He said as to corn most of it has been planted, and there would be many who could comply. Peanuts are not planted as yet in Oklahoma nor in many other parts of the United States. There are many farmers who would welcome the opportunity to participate in this program in 1956 in order to get 100-percent payment, but they cannot get a 100-per-

cent payment unless we do adopt the Cooley amendment, unless we go back to the amendment which Mr. COOLEY has indicated he will go back to and offer again if we defeat the Hope amendment.

I say, let us defeat the Hope amendment for prepayment. Let us stay on a responsible fiscal basis with this program. Let us have the farmer do something for what he is paid by his Government in the form of these compensation payments. Let us get our surplus reductions in effect this year. Everyone has been talking about the need for a reduction of these surpluses now by a soil bank. If we adopt the Hope amendment, you will not get anything to reduce your surplus now. You will not get a soil bank in 1956, you will not have the Government getting anything for the money which it pays out to the farmers this year, except by a contract, which many of them as tenant farmers cannot legally enter into for the following year. You will not have a return on your Government investment, you will not have any opportunity under the program offered by the gentleman from Kansas to get a 100-percent payment by the farmer in this year, 1956.

Let us defeat the Hope amendment and go back to the Cooley amendment in order to have a workable soil bank in 1956.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, with 5 minutes reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I just want to suggest that I do not see why a farmer in Oklahoma, for example, in view of the fact that under this amendment he can be paid this year for what he promises to do next year, would limit his planting this year. I think it defeats the very purpose that we are planning to effectuate here. If a farmer is ready to plant this year and he can get paid this year for not planting next year, he has no incentive for not planting this year. In other words, why do today what you can do tomorrow and get paid for today.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I just want to serve notice on the House that I shall object to any extensions of time and any transfers of time from now on.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That suits me very well.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The thing that I do not understand about the gentleman's position is this, that under the Hope

amendment, as I understand it, there is not anything in the world to prevent this applying to the 1956 crop. Indeed, the amendment is intended to apply to the 1956 crop.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I did not take a position. I was asking for information. I was asking why a farmer should limit his planting this year when he can get paid now for a promise to do it next year.

Mr. KEATING. He would have to limit it this year in order to get paid for this year.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Not necessarily. Under the Hope amendment, he could promise to do it next year, plant his crop this year, and get both.

Mr. KEATING. He would naturally want to get paid for both years' crops if he qualified for it.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I thank the gentleman for trying to answer my query.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I trust you will adopt the Hope amendment. I think it is important, and it can be of immeasurable value to a lot of farmers throughout the country, particularly in the corn area. Out in the Midwest area we will plant corn up to the 10th, 15th, or 20th of May. Let us assume I call up my renter and say "Let us get into this soil bank program. I think it is good; I think it can be advantageous to us." And, we do go into the program. What is the matter with giving him—the tenant—a part of this money when we make a contract? The county committees can very easily determine and find out whether he has a valid contract and has lived up to its provisions. Suppose the total involved is 20 acres. I say to my tenant "Let us start fertilizing. You are going to pay for half of the fertilizer, and I am going to pay for half of the fertilizer," and by that method we will start building up those 20 acres as the soil bank intends we should do. We will be participants in the soil bank plan for 1956. Today we are saying that we want to help the farmer, and yet some would deny him part of the funds from the contract in order to further prepare for his future programs. We are both in this thing together, landlord and tenant, and what is good for the tenant is good for the landlord and vice versa. And, it will help him start his soil bank participation, and I see no valid reason why it could not be done.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Does not the gentleman know that what he is proposing to do is included in this bill under paragraph (b), which is left in the bill? He will get all his money this year without the Hope amendment.

Mr. ARENDS. Why wrangle about it? Why not let him get the prepayment immediately, so that he can go out and buy the fertilizer and buy the seed, and whatever he needs to further prepare his idle acres for the future.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. What the gentleman is talking about the farmer

can get without that amendment. It is already in the bill.

Mr. ARENDS. Does the gentleman mean that he can get the money when he makes the contract?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. When he complies and takes the land out of production.

Mr. ARENDS. He will not be able to show compliance until the county committee checks. Let us tell him that he can have the money, that he has signed the contract in good faith and then he will be able to go right ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] for 2¼ minutes.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYS of Ohio as an amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. HOPE: "Provided, That all payments made pursuant to this act in the calendar year 1956 shall be reported to the Clerk of the House of Representatives upon the same dates and in the same manner as other political contributions or political expenditures are required to be reported under the provision of title 2, section 242 of the United States Code."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the pending amendment and is not germane to any provision of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is germane certainly because it has to do with the money that they are proposing to prepay. Under a previous administration there was a proposal made one time to pay the farmer directly for participating in a program. That was socialism. But if you pay him directly for not participating, under this amendment that is statesmanship. If we are going to be statesmen, I think we ought to have a little check on it and I think the public ought to know. If anybody is so kind as to contribute to my campaign that has to be listed, and everybody knows about it. If there are to be political contributions made, called prepayments, and that is what this boils down to, the public ought to know that. I say the amendment is germane because it has to do with reporting amounts of money to be paid under this bill and to whom they are paid.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

It occurs to the Chair that the amendment simply provides that any payments made shall be reported to the Clerk of the House. The amendment to which the amendment is proposed is an amendment providing for and authorizing payments to be made. On the question of germaneness it seems to the Chair that

the amendment would be germane and the point of order is overruled.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] is recognized for 2¼ minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN. Has not the gentleman from Ohio already used his 2¼ minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] was addressing himself to a point of order that had been raised against his amendment.

The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 2¼ minutes.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished minority leader will pay careful attention, I shall try to convince him why he should vote for the amendment. Before this I was trying to convince the Chair that the amendment was germane.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the gentleman know whether Governor Lausche is for it?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I do not know whether he is for it or not. My guess would be, if he knew about it, and he knew that I had offered it, he would probably be against it, because he has a suspicion, somehow or other, that I do not think he has been a very good governor. And if there is any doubt in anybody's mind as to how I feel about that, I think it can be easily dispelled.

Now that we have disposed of that question, let us go back to the amendment. I think the amendment is a good amendment, because there is no question in anybody's mind on this floor, and in the mind of a very few in the country, about what this prepayment is. It is an attempt to do something political at the last minute because of the fact that reports have come in from a couple of primaries that have been disturbing to Mr. Benson. As a matter of fact, I proposed 2 years ago that we do something about a soil bank, and as recently as 6 months ago Mr. Benson sent word up here that a soil bank was no good and would not work.

I was not kidding a little bit ago when I said there has been a lot in the newspapers about principles. Last year Mr. Benson was for rigid principles and flexible supports, but this year he is for flexible principles and rigid supports. If that is the case, I think we ought to have a little safeguard by letting the public know who gets the money and where it goes. If I comply and get any of it, and I hope I can comply on my farm, I will be glad to tell how much I got, and when.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], to close the debate.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas, the Speaker of the House [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], as I know everyone in this House does. I have been around here a long time. I have watched legislation in this House and I have handled a great many bills in this House. I always tried to know what my bill meant or what any amendments to it meant.

They claimed when this bill came back from the other body it was muddled. If I had to describe the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas I would be compelled to say that it is a muddling amendment. If I were strictly playing politics, as I fear some gentlemen on the floor today are doing, I would want to see the Hope amendment adopted, because I think in its administration it will make more farmers mad than any other provision that you could put in any bill. That is because they are going to be talked to, contracts are going to be offered to them, they are going to have to wait and see, and somebody will come back to them next week or next month asking if they have made up their minds.

It appears to me as good legislating, and knowing what we are talking about, if we vote down the Hope amendment and go back and adopt the amendment originally offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. We would know what we are about. I do not know what we are about in this Hope amendment.

More than that, there are a great many more tenant farmers in this country than there are farm owners. In my country the tenant farmer would have no chance whatsoever to engage in this program because he rents a farm for a year. He rents it from January to January. He does not move until January. When is he going to come in on this program? He will not come into it at all. You might just as well understand that right now when you vote for this amendment.

In the name of good legislation and doing things that we understand, I would ask this House in the name of good legislation and knowing what we are doing to vote down this Hope amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. NICHOLSON) there were—ayes 102, noes 125.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. COOLEY and Mr. HOPE.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 157, noes 181.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I reoffer my amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY: On page 11, line 17, strike out all of lines 17 to 21 and insert:

"(b) Compensation shall be paid to any producer for participating in the agricultural reserve program for any year including 1956 when the Secretary has ascertained that such producer has complied with the

acreage reduction requirements of such program for such year."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to rise and speak in support of section 203 of the farm bill now before the House. This section would specifically authorize the President to negotiate agreements with foreign countries to limit the importation into the United States, products of agricultural commodities such as textiles. This provision was included in the earlier farm bill adopted by Congress, but vetoed by the President, and I greatly hope that this section 203 will be adopted again today. I cannot overemphasize the importance of this provision to the future of the United States textile industry.

The textile industry, including the manufacture of apparel, is America's No. 1 industry. It employs an average of 2.3 million persons, accounting for 14 percent of total manufacturing employment in the United States. The magnitude of this industry, which, with its directly related allied activities, accounts for 1 out of every 6 jobs in American manufacturing, demands our attention. Its economic health is important to everyone. And, unfortunately, the economic stability of this industry is being seriously jeopardized by the tremendous increase in cotton textiles, largely from Japan, which resulted from the 1955 tariff cuts. If action is not taken soon to give some relief to our own textile industry, we may soon find that through excessively low tariffs and lack of prudence we will have rendered useless our own textile industry. And there are many persons who hold that in times of national emergency the textile industry is second only to the steel industry in importance.

There is a very good reason why the textile industry alone cannot withstand the present deluge of cheap Japanese textiles now inundating the American market. The answer is cheap labor. We are proud of the American worker's high standard of living. Just last year, and at the President's request, this Congress voted for an increase in the minimum wage. But need I point out we will be doing American labor little good if we vote to increase the minimum wage and then allow their jobs to be taken away from them by cheap foreign labor. The average hourly wage rate in a United States cotton textile mill is \$1.30. In Japan the hourly wage rate is only 13.6 cents. This is one-tenth of the United States cost. This is why the Japanese textiles can absorb tariff rates and still undersell our domestic market. Japan also has new postwar textile machinery. It has the technical know-how. In fact our own American textile industry has willingly participated in the Government's point 4 program to share our technical knowledge with many underdeveloped countries abroad. And this is how the Government is going to repay our own industry—by letting an influx

of imports destroy our own economy? It is the cheap-labor factor which tips the equation balance in favor of Japan. And this situation can only be remedied by the Government keeping the Japanese imports at a reasonable level.

The textile industry has already sought relief from the Government but to date has been denied such relief. The State Department keeps contending it does not have authority to enter into agreements to limit the imports of textiles. The adoption of section 203 today will make it evident to even the State Department that such authority does exist and that it is the intent of Congress that the textile industry of the United States should not have its very life jeopardized by a deluge of foreign goods manufactured from our own agricultural products sold in the world market at competitive prices which are generally below domestic price levels.

If we do not act today there are many thousands of textile workers, now happy and prosperous, who will be forced to become recipients of relief and welfare checks. I urge the House to include section 203 in the farm bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the 5 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. My inquiry is this: Should this amendment be adopted would it then be in order in a motion to recommit with instructions to amend the language of this amendment if adopted by inserting the word "final" before the word "compensation"?

The CHAIRMAN. That is a question the Speaker would decide when the motion to recommit was made. Under the rules of the House, of course, it is not in order in a motion to recommit to amend an amendment previously adopted. This question, of course, would be decided by the Speaker when the motion to recommit was offered.

Mr. HALLECK. I was under that impression. I suspect any further parliamentary inquiry will have to go over until a later time as to the effect of language that might be adopted as a result of a motion to recommit with instructions.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is recognized.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I say that this amendment will put into operation the soil bank in the good year 1956, as it clearly states, if the Secretary determines or when he determines that the producer has complied with the acreage-reduction requirements. He can pay the full amount of money that is due from the soil bank. He does not have to wait for 6 or 12 months. Just as soon as he determines that the acreage requirements have been complied with, he can pay the farmer.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. So far as I am concerned, as I said before, I do not think the gentleman's amendment makes a single bit of difference in the language of the bill. It is immaterial whether it goes in or stays out. I would not be constrained to make any particular effort about it so far as I am concerned, and I suspect that is probably the idea on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY:

On page 26, strike out all of line 19 and on line 20 strike out through "Representatives."

On page 38, strike out all of subsection (e) (1) and subsection (e) (2) beginning in line 8 down through line 24.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think I can explain these amendments very briefly.

The first one strikes out the following language on page 26, line 19: "for immediate reference to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives." That is the language that comes out.

I understand that that will be done in ordinary routine fashion, therefore the language is not needed at all and should be deleted from this bill.

The same situation applies with reference to the language on page 38 which has the same purpose and provides substantially the same thing. The language that we are striking out is just this:

Any bill or joint resolution embodying the recommendations presented to the Congress under subsection (b) shall, upon introduction in the Senate or House of Representatives, be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate or the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, as the case may be. Such committee shall proceed as expeditiously as possible to consider such bill or joint resolution.

(2) This subsection is enacted by the Congress (A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, and (B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as they relate to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

Now that, too, is exactly what will happen even if this language is deleted. The Committee on Agriculture certainly would proceed expeditiously and I am certain that the Speaker of this House would properly and promptly and appropriately exercise the powers of his office in making these references. It seems to me the language is objectionable and should be taken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABERNETHY: On page 51 after line 17 insert a new section reading as follows:

"Sec. 309. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the level of price support for the 1956 crop of upland cotton shall be not less than 84 percent of the parity price thereof."

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to eliminate what I believe to be an injustice to one of the major segments of American agriculture. Six million people of this country, men, women, and children, are interested in the production of cotton.

A few days ago when the President's message came over he saw fit to increase the price supports on several crops after they had already been fixed by the Department of Agriculture. To directly illustrate what I am speaking of, the price support on wheat for this year had been set at 76 percent of parity. Nevertheless, the Chief Executive saw fit to raise that to 83.7 percent or an increase of 7.7 percent of parity. The price support on corn had been set at 81 percent of parity. Even so, the Chief Executive saw fit to increase the price support on corn and place it at 86.2 percent of parity. The price support had already been set on manufacturing milk at about 82 percent of parity—I believe that is correct—and he saw fit to increase that to slightly more than 84 percent of parity. He announced, however, the price supports would range from 82.5 to 90 percent, but the facts are that he applied the absolute floor to only one of the major crops, and that was cotton.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. In view of the fact that the support program is basically designed for the majority of the farmers, and to protect the small farmers, would the gentleman accept an amendment limiting any loan under this program to \$20,000 maximum per individual?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Well, I do not know that such an amendment would be germane to this amendment. If the gentleman cares to offer the amendment, it would not affect my particular people, because mine are not that big. The gentleman may if he likes, offer such.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, the Secretary thereafter fixed cotton supports at only 82.5 percent.

Now, I am not going to charge that the President and the Secretary of Agriculture have been absolutely unfair about this thing, but it does appear to me that the largest segment of agriculture in my section of the country—cotton—has been discriminated against. Whether it was intentional or not is not for me to say. I do say, however, that cotton has been discriminated against.

Now, my amendment does not raise to or fix the price support on cotton at the same level that we have on corn. It raises the price support by only 1.5 percent, and that is all. It fixes it at 84

percent of parity. It fixes it at approximately the same percentage of parity that wheat will be supported at. It fixes it at approximately the same percentage of parity that milk will be supported at. And it fixes it at 2.2 percent less than corn would be supported at. That is all there is to it and I hope that the committee will support the amendment because I think the cotton farmers of this country are entitled to the same treatment that has been given these other crops.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. In view of the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture wrote a letter to a Member of the other body stating that if certain things were done he would recommend price supports at a figure between 86 and 87 percent of parity for upland cotton in the current year, I do not see how the House can oppose the gentleman's amendment. It is sound. The adoption of the amendment would assist in stabilizing the income of cotton producers which is so badly needed at this time. I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi will be agreed to.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think the gentleman makes a good point. The Secretary did send a letter over to the other body indicating that if there were a change made in the base, he would support cotton at approximately 87 percent.

I hope the Committee will support my amendment.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I feel it should be pointed out in this connection that those who make their living growing cotton have already taken a cut in acreage of more than 35 percent. Actually, it is more than 60 percent from what we had at the high levels back in the thirties. But in the last 3 years we have taken a cut of 35 percent of total cotton production. Corn under this bill will take practically no cut. And yet we are guaranteeing to the producers of corn 86.2 percent of the full parity where they comply. And he has to take only a token cut in order to qualify. The cotton man in order to qualify has already taken 35 percent and must take more. Then he is not going to get 86.2 percent support but only 82.5 percent. The President says it is enough for him to get, but he must take 3 or 4 times as much acreage cut as the man takes in a doubtful corn State.

I only call attention to the fact that we have a discriminatory system under the supports established by the President of the United States and nobody else. I am not putting it on Ezra Benson. He did not establish these supports. The President of the United States established them.

All this will do is to say that the man who is growing cotton on 65 percent of his normal acreage should get 84 percent of parity, while the man who is growing 90 percent of his normal production of corn is getting 86.2 percent support on

it. We are just trying to correct only half of the injustice that has been done.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARTIN) there were—ayes 127, noes 128.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ABERNETHY and Mr. HOPE.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 168, noes 152.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENNINGS: On page 29, line 22, strike out "price supported crops" and insert "agricultural commodities."

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I support the farm legislation we are considering here today. It has been made more acceptable by the adoption of the Albert amendment, which will permit pastureland to be included in the soil bank, and by the inclusion of section 211, page 41. This latter provision will continue the processing of surplus commodities into a form suitable for home or institutional use. Since last year, under provisions of Public Law 311, we have been processing surplus grain into flour and meal for distribution to the needy. I introduced a bill to provide for such processing and it was supported by a large number of my colleagues.

I wish to offer an amendment which I think will be noncontroversial. It merely changes the wording on page 29, line 22, to read "agricultural commodities" rather than "price supported crops."

There are many of us who do not represent areas where the so-called basic crops, or other crops, are price supported. My amendment means that the crops which are basic to any area will come under this section of this bill.

Many of our farmers feel that they should not be asked to take their land out of production and put it into the soil bank when the Federal Government is engaged in the leasing of its land for the production of surplus agriculture commodities. I must say that I agree with them.

This section of the bill, with my amendment, gives the President the authority, where it is practical, to restrict the leasing of land for the production of agricultural commodities when they are in surplus supply.

As a matter of fact, we have a total of 245,589,000 acres of federally owned grazing land. For farming purposes, we have 1,400,000 acres of Federal land being leased to individuals, who are not paying taxes on that land, but who are producing agricultural products. Much of this production is surplus and all of it is in competition with our farmers who own their land and who are paying their taxes.

Earlier this year, I introduced a bill to prohibit the use of Federal land for

the production agricultural commodities, including livestock. I trust that this amendment will be adopted. I think it is needed, and it will make this legislation more palatable to the people in areas who are not being supported and who are not raising price supported products.

I repeat, if we are going to begin a soil bank, let us take the Government's acreage out of production and out of competition with the individual farmer.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. I wish to commend the gentleman for offering the amendment. It seems to me it makes a lot of sense. I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. JENNINGS. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I also would like to commend the gentleman for his thorough study of this matter.

Mr. JENNINGS. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McINTIRE as a substitute to the amendment offered by Mr. JENNINGS:

On page 4, line 2, strike out the word "and" preceding the word "Ohio."

On page 4, line 3, insert after the word "respectively" the following: "And such other field crops as the Secretary may designate."

On page 11, line 24, strike out "\$750,000,000" and insert "\$800,000,000."

On page 12, line 4, strike out "and" preceding the word "tobacco."

Strike the period following "\$45,000,000", replace the same with a comma, and add the following: "and other crops, \$50,000,000."

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, as this amendment involves two subsections I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I do not think this amendment is in conflict with the objective of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS]. I think it somewhat supplements and perhaps strengthens the language of the amendment offered by my colleague.

The objective of this amendment is one which I discussed before the House in general debate yesterday.

This is an amendment which was offered to the committee in executive session and was voted down, but I am in about the same position in that respect as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], a member of the committee, because that amendment was offered to the committee by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], and it, too, was rejected in an executive session of the committee.

The pending amendment would place the soil-bank legislation somewhat in parallel with the Agricultural Act of

1949. In that act the basic commodities are listed in title I. The designated non-basic commodities are listed in title II. In title III of that act provision is made for all other commodities in regard to which the Secretary might elect to carry on a price-support activity at his discretion.

This amendment would place at the discretion of the Secretary the authority to place into the acreage-reserve provisions of the soil-bank legislation such other field crops as the Secretary may designate.

Let me call to your attention some of the commodities with regard to which the Secretary in his discretion has set up price supports under title III. If I am not in error, under the authorization of the Secretary in the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, price-support activities are in operation on flax, soybeans, dried beans, oats, barley, and grain sorghum.

This legislation, by provisions incorporated in it, will bring within the area of participation oats, barley, and grain sorghums which are commodities in title III of the Agricultural Act of 1949. The amendment which I am offering as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia would simply place in the hands of the Secretary the discretionary authority to use the provisions of the acreage reserve on such other field crops as he might select.

May I add this other point. We are dealing in a substantial degree, as we consider soil-bank legislation, a situation in which, in part at least, the objective is the management of inventories of commodities in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The commodities which would be within the purview of this amendment do not have the facilities of any loan operations and surplus supply must rest on the shoulders of the operator himself. Oftentimes those commodities become burdensome. This provision would provide a vehicle by which at his discretion the Secretary might use the provisions of the acreage reserve section of the soil-bank legislation to be of some assistance in the diversion of acreage out of the production of those commodities.

I would urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. It seems to me that the gentleman's amendment might be more appropriately presented at some other point in the bill. The section under consideration is entitled "Production on Government Lands Prohibited" and it reads this way:

The President shall, with respect to farm-lands now or hereafter owned by the Federal Government, restrict insofar as practicable the leasing of lands for the production of price supported crops in surplus supply.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS] proposes to strike out "price supported crops" and to insert in lieu thereof two words "agricultural commodities."

Mr. MCINTIRE. Do I understand the chairman of the Committee on Agricul-

ture is questioning the appropriateness of my amendment in this section? I may be in error on that.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. It seems to me there are Members here who might like to vote for Mr. JENNINGS' amendment and might at the same time vote for the gentleman's amendment. I would withhold it for the time being.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine.

May I ask the gentleman, would it not be more appropriate for him to withdraw his amendment? Let us vote on the Jennings amendment and get that out of the way.

Mr. MCINTIRE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. I think that would be the better way.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment in order to present it perhaps at a more appropriate section of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCINTIRE:

On page 4, line 2, strike out the word "and" preceding the word "Ohio."

On page 4, line 3, insert after the word "respectively" the following: "and such other field crops as the Secretary may designate."

On page 11, line 24, strike "\$750,000,000," and insert "\$800,000,000."

On page 12, line 4, strike "and" preceding the word tobacco, strike the period following "\$45,000,000", replace same with a comma and add the following: "and other crops, \$50,000,000."

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MASON. Under the rules of the House does a man get two 5-minute discussions on the same amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdrew his amendment, and it has been offered again. The gentleman from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of my committee for his kindness in straightening me out on the proper place to put in this amendment. I have no further argument on this point, so I yield to the chairman of our committee if he has any questions.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to say to the gentleman that while I did discuss it with him very briefly here some time ago, I have not given it thorough consideration and I am not in a position to say whether it should go into the bill at this time or not. I would like to hear from some Members on that side to express their views. But, the gentleman

is proposing to add an authorization for an additional \$50 million; is that true?

Mr. MCINTIRE. That is true.

Mr. COOLEY. What other crops does the gentleman anticipate the Secretary might use this \$50 million in connection with?

Mr. MCINTIRE. At times flax, soybeans, and dry beans might be included. Certainly the commodity which is predominant in my area, such as potatoes, might be included and such other commodities as the Secretary might wish. I will say that my purpose in offering this amendment is far more broad than that of a single commodity. It is my purpose to make this legislation somewhat parallel with the provisions of the act of 1949 which does give the Secretary discretionary authority on all of the commodities, as I have indicated before.

Mr. COOLEY. Of course, the soil bank was directed at the surplus problem primarily; also building up the soil reserve of the country. I do not suppose the gentleman would anticipate that the Secretary would apply the provisions of the soil bank to a crop which was not in surplus supply.

Mr. MCINTIRE. No. As I said, Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat constrained to offer this amendment but on the point which you have just made, there was the vote for approval of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]. Certainly, grazing acres can hardly be considered surplus in comparison to the inventory we are dealing with in relation to basic commodities. On that basis I felt this had appropriateness, also.

Mr. COOLEY. The amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], contemplates not only a reduction in grazing acreage but in livestock population.

Mr. MCINTIRE. I appreciate that.

Mr. COOLEY. I am perfectly willing, subject to the approval of my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], and subject to the action of the House, of course, to take this amendment to conference and see that it is thoroughly considered, and if it is acceptable, to accept it. I have no particular reason to oppose it, but I would like to hear from the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I am in the same position as the chairman of our committee. I have not had an opportunity to carefully study the implication of the amendment. I am familiar with the text of it, but the committee had no hearings on it and we have not had enough information for me to form an opinion on it. If the chairman is willing to take it to conference with the understanding that we will make a further study of it before any decision is reached on it, I would have no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to say by way of complimenting my distinguished colleague that I have never known him to sponsor anything that did not have some merit. I am sure he is

convinced that this is a very meritorious amendment. But, being in the position I am in at the moment, not having had any hearings on this amendment, I still say it should be more thoroughly considered, and I am perfectly willing to take it to conference and give it more careful consideration.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman's amendment would not apply to any commodity whose condition of surplus and otherwise did not meet the general objectives of the act; is not that true?

Mr. MCINTIRE. That is right.

Mr. ALBERT. So if there were a surplus in beans or potatoes or the problem of surplus reduction were present, the Secretary under this amendment would have discretion to give treatment to those commodities similar to that given to other commodities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE] has expired.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute additional.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRUMPACKER: On page 6, line 2, strike out the period at the end of line 2 and insert "Provided, however, That the provisions of section 107 (D) shall apply hereunder."

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, this is a relatively simple amendment. All it would do would be to give the farm-

ers the same opportunity to present their case, in the event they are charged with a violation of their contract under the acreage-reserve program which the bill, as written, would give them under the conservation-reserve program.

On page 16 of the bill, at the bottom of the page, under subsection (d) and continuing on page 17, there is the following—

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. So far as I can see, there is nobody around here who would object to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say briefly that there is an elaborate procedure in the section I just referred to for the farmers to be heard and to take an appeal in case the Secretary, acting through the county committees, seeks to terminate their contracts. There is no similar provision under the acreage-reserve program and I think there should be; that the reasons for providing such an opportunity are the same under both circumstances. Therefore I think the amendment should be agreed to, to give the farmers equal rights under both programs.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to offer an amendment. I am for the soil bank, and unless it gets loaded up too much with bad amendments I intend to vote for this bill. I think the soil bank certainly is a present necessity. But I am reminded by hearings now going on before our Foreign Affairs Committee that it is not a final solution to our agricultural problem.

American agriculture is on a net export basis. There are about 40 million

acres in the last decade that have been devoted exclusively to export. Unless and until American agriculture can compete in the world markets without subsidies for that competition, we are going to continue to have a farm problem.

I am reminded, and I want to remind my brethren, that our agricultural problem is not only a domestic problem. It is an international problem, since we are on an export basis. That is recognized in this bill.

Section 207 of this bill contributes toward the solution of the farm-surplus problem by providing for reimbursement of the Commodity Credit Corporation for ocean freight costs on products shipped overseas under title II of Public Law 408, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and by increasing the amount under title II for relief shipments of agricultural products from \$300 million to \$500 million. As I understand it, this section has administration support. Sections 202 and 203 in this bill do not have administration support. All these sections deal with the foreign aspects of the agricultural problem.

I want to remind my colleagues that in the past 10 years we have shipped abroad under Government programs \$12,366,000,000 of agricultural products. The total of exports outside Government programs was \$20,777,000,000. Our total agricultural exports during that period were \$33,150,000,000. This means that over one-third of the agricultural exports from the United States over the past 10 years have been through Government programs; \$11,045,000,000 of that has been grants, where we bought the products from the American farmers at going prices, the taxpayers paid for them, and they were given away in various foreign-aid programs.

Here is a table submitted by the Department of Agriculture to our committee showing the details of these exports:

United States agricultural exports—Grants and sales under Government programs, sales outside Government programs, fiscal years 1945-46 through 1954-55
[Millions of dollars]

Type of export	Bread grains	Coarse grains	Cotton and lint	Leaf tobacco	Fats, oils, and oilseeds	Dairy products	Other	Total
Government programs:								
Grants:								
1945-46.....	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	1,365
1946-47.....	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	800
1947-48.....	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	1,569
1948-49.....	991	212	512	107	214	81	185	2,302
1949-50.....	606	209	605	149	161	33	122	1,975
1950-51.....	330	133	444	132	55	47	46	1,187
1951-52.....	191	72	182	56	25	2	52	580
1952-53.....	97	79	196	10	19	1	34	436
1953-54.....	123	26	164	—	23	70	42	448
1954-55.....	70	24	95	(2)	55	128	12	383
Total grants.....								11,045
Sales under Government programs:								
Foreign currency sales:								
1953-54 (sec. 550).....	40	2	27	27	14	—	6	116
1954-55:								
Title I, Public Law 480.....	39	9	10	3	2	—	—	62
Sec. 550.....	32	7	24	11	13	—	6	95
Sec. 402.....	81	3	93	—	6	1	3	186
Total, 1954-55.....	152	19	126	14	21	1	9	343
Total, foreign currency sales.....	192	21	153	41	35	1	15	459

¹ ECA liftings in 1948-49 and 1949-50; paid shipments for ECA, MSA, and FOA regular and special programs thereafter, Army civilian supply shipments; calculated export values for USDA sec. 416 donations; title II, Public Law 480 shipments based on CCC data; lend-lease, UNRRA, Greek-Turkish aid, interim aid, United States foreign relief and International Refugee Organization.

² Commodity detail not available.

³ Negligible.

⁴ FOA and ICA data on sec. 550 and sec. 402 shipments; title I, Public Law 480 data based on FAS reports (ICA figures exclude ocean freight).

United States agricultural exports—Grants and sales under Government programs, sales outside Government programs, fiscal years 1945-46 through 1954-55—Continued

[Millions of dollars]

Type of export	Bread grains	Coarse grains	Cotton and lint	Leaf tobacco	Fats, oils, and oilseeds	Dairy products	Other	Total
Sales under Government programs—Continued								
Barter sales: ¹								
1948-49.....		(²)	8					8
1949-50.....	6	1	1					9
1950-51.....	39	4						43
1951-52.....	9	4		1				14
1952-53.....	22	9		1	2			34
1953-54.....	98	23	(²)		3	(²)	(²)	125
1954-55.....								
Total, barter sales.....	174	41	9	2	5			233
Loans: ¹								
1948-49.....			38				4	42
1949-50.....			22					22
1950-51.....			12				2	14
1951-52.....	100	19	94					273
1952-53.....	53	1	52	10				96
1953-54.....			113					113
1954-55.....	10		59					69
Total loans.....	203	20	390	10			6	629
Total grants and sales under Government programs:								
1945-46.....	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	1,365
1946-47.....	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	800
1947-48.....	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	1,569
1948-49.....	991	212	550	107	214	81	189	2,344
1949-50.....	606	209	725	149	161	33	122	2,005
1950-51.....	336	134	457	132	55	47	48	1,210
1951-52.....	390	95	276	56	25	2	52	896
1952-53.....	139	84	248	21	19	1	34	546
1953-54.....	185	37	304	28	39	70	48	711
1954-55.....	330	66	281	14	79	128	21	920
Total United States agricultural exports under Government programs.....								12,366
Sales outside Government programs:								
1945-46.....	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	1,485
1946-47.....	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	2,810
1947-48.....	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	1,936
1948-49.....	327	68	265	119	145	149	413	1,486
1949-50.....	87	30	224	86	107	81	366	981
1950-51.....	425	244	484	142	338	106	463	2,201
1951-52.....	692	245	928	271	364	97	560	3,157
1952-53.....	547	237	328	264	241	72	584	2,273
1953-54.....	265	200	376	272	372	86	653	2,225
1954-55.....	168	173	410	291	419	83	680	2,223
Total sales outside Government programs.....								20,777
Total United States agricultural exports:								
1945-46.....	506	146	418	275	124	315	963	2,857
1946-47.....	894	445	503	326	158	236	958	3,610
1947-48.....	1,371	375	341	206	188	241	783	3,505
1948-49.....	1,318	280	815	226	359	230	602	3,830
1949-50.....	693	239	949	235	268	114	488	2,956
1950-51.....	761	378	941	274	303	153	511	3,411
1951-52.....	1,082	340	1,204	327	389	99	612	4,053
1952-53.....	686	321	576	285	290	73	618	2,819
1953-54.....	450	237	680	300	411	156	701	2,936
1954-55.....	498	239	691	305	498	211	701	3,143
Grand total United States agricultural exports.....	8,349	3,000	7,208	2,759	3,048	1,828	6,957	33,150

¹ Commodity detail not available.² Negligible.³ Deliveries to contractors.⁴ Pakistan, Afghanistan, Spanish, India, Export-Import Bank, USDA loans.⁵ Include estimates of sec. 416 donations; commodities are not identified by name in official United States export statistics.

NOTE.—All data preliminary; some estimated. Due to differences in methods of valuation, comparisons between programs and total exports do not reflect quantities included. Due to rounding, figures may not add to totals shown.

Source: Trade Statistics and Economic Geography Branch; Trade Policy Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Feb. 1, 1956.

These farm products served a useful purpose in our foreign policy, of course, during that period, but I remind my brethren that the most gigantic and effective farm price-support activity of our Government in the past 10 years has been this foreign-aid program of buying up these products at full prices to the farmers and distributing them overseas for relief, war recovery, and defense support. It is when the program began to taper off that we started to have a farm problem in this country.

I want to point out once more to the House that two parts of the proposed bill, sections 202 and 203, are neither sought nor desired by the administration.

Section 202 would reduce the quantity of long-staple cotton that may be imported into the United States. The section would also require the Commodity

Credit Corporation to embark on a new export sales program for disposal abroad of its present stocks of domestically produced extra-long staple cotton. Under present circumstances and in the light of all the factors bearing on this problem, the administration believes that writing either of these provisions into law is undesirable.

Special questions are raised about section 202 (a) at this time in view of the expanded consumption, declining stocks and improved competitive position of American-Egyptian cotton in the domestic market.

Section 202 (b) also raises serious questions since it would require an export sales program involving Government subsidies for a type of cotton which the United States has supplied to world markets in only negligible quantities in the past. This governmental sales op-

eration could not be defended on any grounds of regaining a previous share of international trade. The major traditional suppliers of such cotton in world markets would have grounds to consider this type of competition as unfair and unwarranted. Such an export program would be regarded abroad as a direct contravention of principles internationally accepted in world trade and of the assurance given by the United States in the Organization of American States at the time of the Korean emergency that this country would avoid abnormal disturbances in world markets in liquidating emergency stocks.

Section 203 would authorize the President to negotiate with foreign governments agreements limiting United States imports. The President would also be authorized to issue regulations to carry out any such agreement. No legislative

standards are established nor would the extent of restriction be limited except by the determination of the President as to what action is appropriate.

The administration believes that the authorizations proposed in section 203 are unnecessary and undesirable. Such authorizations would surely encourage pressures to bypass the procedures established by existing legislation which provide for careful analysis, public hearings, and due regard for all affected interests. Section 203 is discretionary but it would create widespread uncertainty and fear of a general retreat from the United States policy of fostering an expansion of mutually profitable international trade. The section would be taken by numerous groups as an open invitation to bring unrestrained pressure on the President for restrictive agreements and regulations, however unjustified on any grounds previously recognized by the foreign economic policy or the international trade agreements of this Government.

It is not my purpose to offer amendments to strike these two sections because I do not want to complicate matters today by seeking a full discussion of the foreign aspects of the agricultural program.

We have the foreign aspects of agriculture and the agricultural problem and disposal of agricultural surpluses before our Committee on Foreign Affairs. For instance, today we were asked to authorize \$1,500,000 for administrative expenses of the International Cooperation Administration under Public Law 480. At the appropriate time I hope that we will get this entire agricultural program in line with our total policies, foreign and domestic. Meanwhile, let us remember that we no longer have the gigantic price-support mechanism of foreign aid for agriculture, and we must find other solutions.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, there are many things in this bill that I do not like. There are some more left out that I think ought to go into an agricultural bill, particularly at this time.

I head two rather important subcommittees, one on family farms and the other on the rice industry. If those two subcommittees and our Committee on Agriculture will back me up, in due time, and I trust during this session, we will propose legislation to this House which would go far to straighten out the family farm, that segment of agriculture which is suffering the worst of any at this time. I do not think they are adequately taken care of in this bill, although I must say we have done the very best we know how. That we propose to take up in our subcommittee shortly.

The same thing is true of the rice industry, which has a plan of its own which the industry feels will take it completely out of the control part of the agricultural program and within the next 2 or 3 years make it self-supporting without any Government participation.

I suppose that in a short time I shall vote for the passage of this so-called agriculture bill, H. R. 10875. Distaste-

ful as it is, it has been rammed down my throat, and I am doing my best to digest it. There is almost nothing in it to benefit my people as they want to be and deserve to be benefited.

The small farmer who could have been so materially assisted to maintain his traditional place in the American economy will have to be satisfied with whatever crumbs he can scrape up from the floor in accordance with the famous "trickle down" theory which led to ruin once before, well within the memory of all of us.

Small farmers cannot possibly afford to take out of production any portion of the meager acreage allotments they have under the present program. Greatly increased costs and reduced prices for their products have already forced many to leave the farm and seek other means of making a living. At this point he must produce all he possibly can on his few acres to keep his head above water.

After we sweep this present mess under the rug, I hope that the Family Farm Subcommittee will bring out a bill which will say to both sides of the House, "Here is something which will reestablish the family farmer to the place he deserves—decency and stability in our economy." I want to lay that before you and before the Secretary of Agriculture and the President, and to find out once and for all if they mean what they say when they claim to have the interest of the family farmer at heart.

To the committee, here and now, I want to say that if you do not do something of that kind you will, before very long, deal with the family farmer as a social problem, which will be much more difficult to solve if you do not treat it as it should be—a major and vital problem of agriculture.

I was bitterly disappointed that an experiment recommended by the entire rice industry was eliminated from the present bill because Mr. Benson and the President did not like it. They, in their wisdom, said it would not work. Every phase of the rice industry said it would. Mr. Benson, whom I thought had been hired out to represent the farmer, basically, has what he calls the Rice Industry Advisory Committee. I challenge him to consult with that committee and to listen to their side of the plan which they submitted.

It has been misnamed "the two-price system for rice." Actually, it is one price so far as the farmers are concerned, and it would place the entire industry in a position to fight for the world market on an equal basis with the rice industry everywhere in the world. Whatever the difference between the world market and the farmers' fair price, it would be made up by adjustment in the domestic price.

It is most significant that the rice industry feels that the plan which they unanimously recommended would in a very short time, possibly 2 or 3 years, make it unnecessary to have any controls at all.

Mr. Benson did not consult with his Rice Industry Advisory Committee be-

fore he recommended to the President that the plan would not work.

While I am on the subject of that Rice Industry Advisory Committee let me put the spotlight on a strange attitude of Mr. Benson in regard to its membership. I have here a list of the 17 men who compose it. Every member, so far as I know, is an honest and conscientious man and each will represent his own interest to the best of his ability. The rice industry is divided into three distinct segments. First comes the farmer, next comes the warehouseman, and third the miller. In most places there is another who has a separate part in the industry whose primary interest is furnishing the water to the farmers. Generally these different groups work in harmony with each other, but when it comes to a showdown, each will very naturally look after his own interest. For a number of years the farmers in the Rice Belt have asked for representation on Mr. Benson's advisory committee. I have made their wishes known to Mr. Benson repeatedly, but he will not recognize the farmers as such. Among the 17 members of that committee there is just exactly 1 whose only interest in the rice industry is farming. Why does Mr. Benson refuse to recognize the farmers? I do not know.

I have talked to many members of the advisory committee and every one has agreed there should be more farmers on it, if only to satisfy them that they are being consulted and that their views are reaching just as far up the ladder as those of the millers, the warehousemen, and the canal owners. All of this I have pointed out to Mr. Benson, and my last word which came during the present session was, and I quote from a letter signed by Under Secretary True D. Morse, "No changes in the membership of the committee are contemplated at this time, although various organizations not now represented on the committee have indicated a desire to be represented." I pointed out to Mr. Morse that I have not recommended any more organizations, but I have and still do suggest a few farmers.

Again, I point out to him and to Mr. Benson what I have told them in the past—all you can do by complying is make yourselves a few friends.

The Rice Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, is now trying to provide some measure of protection for the industry. Possibly the other body will again amend the bill to take care of it. If so, I certainly hope that our body will look with favor on the recommendation of the rice industry which asked, above all, to try to work itself out from under Government controls and subsidies of any kind.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON: On page 51, after line 17, add a new subsection (e).

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the total amount of price support made available under this or any other act to any person for any year through loans to such person, or through purchases made by Commodity Credit Corporation from such person, shall not exceed \$25,000. The term "person" shall mean any individual, partnership, firm,

joint-stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, or agency of a State. In the event of any loan to or purchase from a cooperative marketing association, such limitation shall apply to the amount of price support made available through such cooperative association to each person. The limitation herein on the amount of price support made available to any person shall not apply if price support is extended by purchases of a product of an agricultural commodity from processors and the Secretary determines that it is impracticable to apply such limitations."

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the bill in that it amends a law which is not considered in this bill and which is not before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Ohio on the point of order.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this is a point which affects all agricultural legislation. We are dealing here with a basic act of agriculture which is tied in as a full and complete subject. This is not a field which can be divided down into various subject matters. This is an overall program. This, it seems to me, is as germane to this section certainly as was price supports for cotton and certainly as germane as price supports on acreage allotments for any other crop of agriculture. I submit to you that as it is a part of the entire program, it is germane. This is the only opportunity in agricultural legislation that I know of this year that this proposition has been able to be offered in this fashion.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that this is not a price-support bill, and there are no amendments to the price-support law in the pending legislation.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Would the gentleman indicate that other similar amendments to price supports were also not germane to the legislation?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The gentleman from Mississippi was addressing the Chair and did not understand the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Mississippi on the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the rule of germaneness specifically declares that an amendment to be germane has to involve an amendment or a change in the law that is being considered in the bill before us. The bill before us involves the soil-bank matter and is entirely new as was brought out by the Secretary of Agriculture. In fact, the point was made very clear in lengthy discussions before the Committee on Rules by the distinguished leaders of the House on the other side that this was an entirely new law and could not be covered except by new legislation. This subject matter is entirely new and that is what brought forth this particular legislation.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PRIEST). The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, it appears to the Chair,

goes far beyond the scope of the bill under consideration. The Chair desires to read just a portion of the first sentence of the amendment, which is as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the total amount of price support made available under this or any other act to any person—

Therefore, because the amendment goes far beyond the scope of the pending bill, the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Chair for his consideration.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when we started consideration of this bill this morning, I assumed, apparently somewhat mistakenly, that major amendments, outside of some of those we knew would be under consideration, would not have such support as would bring them to adoption in the Committee of the Whole. As I said at the outset, I sincerely hope that in this effort to pass a good, sound, workable farm bill we would have something that we could all be proud of, and that would go on to final enactment as a part of the law.

Two amendments have been adopted that I do not think should have been adopted, and in view of the last ruling, probably one of them would have been subject to a point of order had a point of order been made at that time.

I refer to the Albert amendment that has to do with grazing, and the Abernethy amendment that has to do with cotton.

I just say now that when we go back into the House it is our responsibility to call the roll on those amendments.

In respect to the Albert grazing amendment, as I indicated, I had serious doubts as to how far reaching it might be. I had not had an opportunity to look at it, but in the meantime a memorandum has been handed to me, gotten up by responsible people, who are very certain that the amendment is ill-advised. They say it would be almost impossible to administer it, first, because there is no method by which a base period for livestock units can be determined, except by taking the ranchers' word.

Second, it would be impossible to police any reduction in livestock numbers, first because of a lack of base; second, because there is no way to check them except by count; and, third, the livestock would actually have to be slaughtered to be assured of a reduction.

Next, there would be no way to police the grazing of rangeland except to fence off the reserve acreage. They tell me the cost of fencing would run about \$6 for one side of an acre, or \$600 to fence all four sides of 20 acres.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. No. I would like to conclude this statement, and then the gentleman can challenge it if he so desires.

There would be much noncompliance. There are about 300 million acres of grazing land in the United States. If

payment were to be made on 10 percent of those acres, the average rate of payment would be about \$1.70 per acre. That would be somewhat less than the cost of fencing one side of an acre. Then it would force liquidation of livestock numbers. That would mean that livestock prices would be very much depressed. The Government is paying high incentive payments to wool growers in an attempt to raise sheep numbers. So the effect of this would be to work in the opposite direction—pay ranchers to reduce sheep numbers. It would tend to reduce the demand for forage and feed grains, which are in surplus supply.

Likewise, in connection with the Abernethy amendment, I do not think that it has any place here. It deals with an entirely different matter.

I only make these statements at this time because we shall have an opportunity when we go back into the House to correct what I think has been ill-advised action on the part of the Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] is recognized.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I realize, of course, the members of the committee have first call on the time, but I have been trying since noon today to get the floor. I do not say this in criticism of the committee, but certainly there are a great many of us who have farmers in our districts and we are vitally concerned with some provisions in this farm bill, and certainly it seems to me we should have been given a little more opportunity to have brought those thoughts to the floor.

I would like in particular to mention the rice situation. The original bill, H. R. 12, that passed this House had a program for the ricegrowers, a program on which they were thoroughly sold and which they wanted to support and which would have removed them from support by the Federal Government, but in the bill we have before us I cannot find anything which will do the ricegrower the least bit of good. I supported the gentleman from Virginia in his amendment. I did so because in my area we have many crops which are not the so-called basics, and they are crops in which we are vitally concerned.

There are some other gimmicks in the bill for which I do not care, but I am going to support this because I believe it offers, at the moment, the only possible opportunity for the farmers of America to reap any benefit this year or in the immediate future from supports. I would certainly hope that the committee would consider in the immediate future a program for the ricegrowers, because it would seem to me it is something that they as a large segment of the agricultural community of this Nation are entitled to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX].

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, my question deals with section 126, on page 29, which provides for the pooling of certain farm operations which permits farmers to pool their rights and to participate jointly in the conservation reserve program.

My question to the chairman of the committee is: Just how broad a pooling program is contemplated under section 126?

The report on the bill under section 125 states merely "will permit farmers to pool their rights to participate jointly in the conservation reserve program."

Is this on a county basis? Is it on a township basis? Or is it on a State basis? Or just what are the rights of pooling land under the soil-conservation program?

Mr. COOLEY. I think I can say to the gentleman that it is not restricted by townships or by counties, but I think it is contemplated that where a family owns more than 1 farm they can carry out the conservation practices on 1 farm and not carry them out on all; in other words, that they can pool the several farms into 1 operating unit.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, this soil bank, however it originated, is not going to settle the situation in North Dakota at all. In North Dakota we are already limited to these few acres that we cannot make a living on on what we can plant. Now you come along with this soil bank and instead of taking it out of the rest of your land you take it out of the few acres you are allowed to plant. So if I am allowed 41 acres now, I reduce that 20 percent or 8 acres more, and I have 33 acres left.

While you are limiting us to these few acres, at the same moment the Government is extending leases on Indian reservations, where I have seen furrows 16 miles long that do not turn out for township roads. While you are limiting the family type of farms and which limitations will drive those farms out of existence, at the same time you are spreading the right to raise wheat all over these Indian reservations. The same Government that limits family-type farms out of existence, the same Government leases whole Indian reservations for wheat.

All this soil bank will do to the family-type farms is to make the entire collapse of these farms more certain, because it increases the loss of acreage which will eventually destroy small farms.

Of course, the farmer is paid for destroying himself. The administration must believe that this little cash payment will keep his mind off the fate that awaits him.

I first heard of this soil bank in 1935 when Secretary of Agriculture Henry Wallace recommended it. Along with this plan the Secretary recommended that we plow up every third row of cotton, kill off the pigs, and

butcher dairy cows. I thought the whole thing appeared crazy.

Now, after 21 years, the present Secretary of Agriculture resurrects a part of this crazy plan and insists upon its adoption. Last year he said it would work, but this year he has changed his mind. As long as the President is praying for this soil bank as his only remedy for the ills of agriculture, I will vote for the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, since the amendment has been adopted giving to our cotton farmers a fair deal, I am for this bill and I hope the House does not reverse itself because if price supports are raised for other products they should have been raised for cotton also.

What I got up to speak to you about is to commend the committee for writing into section 203 a provision that makes it absolutely clear the President has the right to protect the textile industry of America if it is to be faced not only with the cheaper labor of Japan and other foreign countries but also with lower priced cotton that Japan can now buy at lower prices than our mills in America.

I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture if there has been any indication from the Secretary of Agriculture or from the President that the President will exercise this right that you make abundantly clear in this bill that he has.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not recall that either the President or the Secretary of Agriculture has expressed any views about the matter, but I agree with the gentleman from Georgia it is very important and we will have to assume, since Congress itself has attached so much importance to the provision, that the executive branch of the Government will take notice and will undertake negotiations looking to such limitation.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman's answer is reassuring. Certainly the textile industry in this country will need this protection, in fact, needs it now. For textile imports from low-wage countries are flooding this country with textile products. By concentrating from time to time on special types of fabrics and garments Japan is gradually driving many of our textile manufacturers out of business or into different types of fabrics.

Only a few days ago announcement was made by a textile firm of New England employing 400 people that it would be forced to close unless it got some protection from the flood of Japanese imports. In my own State, already, mills making velveteen have been forced to shift to other fabrics or close.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, in line with what I have heretofore said on the floor of the House, the farmers of this country are fair minded. They want to do the thing that is right in respect to the Government under which they live. They do not want the Government or

anyone else to do for them anything to which they are not justly entitled.

The farmers are a minority group in number, but they represent a most important segment and share of the economy of America. The farmer does not complain because other groups are making gains, but he does not understand why he, at least, is not in position to hold his own in our economy. It is difficult for him to understand why he does not receive a share of income to which he is really entitled. It is rather hard for the farmer to understand why industry, for example, is expanding in all directions, why the steel companies are making more profits than ever and are presently increasing the price of steel, when at the same time he is required to take lower prices for his products. Farmers' income during the last year is lower than it has been in the past.

He is taking a less price for his product than it actually costs him to produce it. He reads through the newspapers, however, that manufacturing companies receive favors by way of tax incentives for building equipment that may be used for the defense of our country. In other words, industry gets the profits to which they are entitled and gets a bonus for doing it. To the farmer it is described as parity payments; for the manufacturer, it is described as incentive payments. In other areas it is subsidies. The farmer does not object to good wages. He favors good wages. He knows good wages are an indication of prosperity. In this respect, again, he does not receive his share of the national income.

He reads that steamship lines are provided with subsidies but not designated by that name. The farmer observes the stock market is flourishing and that stocks on the New York Stock Exchange are higher than they have ever been. This does not apply to the grain market or the livestock market. The same applies to railroad stocks and utility stocks that show good profits. Only recently 1 of the great railroad companies has declared a split in stock of 4 or 5 shares for 1, which indicates a good profit. There is no criticism about it. Neither is there a complaint because railroad companies have received approval of a 5-percent increase in their charges for transportation. He observes that utilities are really guaranteed a fair profit by reason of rate charges and many of them have recently had increases. All of these and other indications seem to leave the farmer out of the category of prosperity even though he produces the most important commodity of all—food and fiber.

According to the USDA report, since 1945 the farmer's share of the consumer's retail food dollar has declined from 55 cents in 1945 to 41 cents last year. Some time ago, when wheat was selling for \$2.80 per bushel, a pound loaf of bread sold for 14 cents. Now, while wheat is selling for \$2.15 per bushel, a similar loaf of bread sells for 18 cents. According to the USDA report, from which I have just quoted, the income of farmers last year was reduced by \$1 billion. The average income was reduced within a little more than a year from \$913 to \$860. While this was going

on, the income of nonfarmers was more than doubled during the same period.

One of the good indicators of prosperity is that of life insurance companies. Almost all large life insurance companies report a bigger and better business during the last year than any year before. One company reports that it did \$2½ billion worth of life insurance business last year.

Mr. Speaker, this statement is not made for the purpose of indicating in any way or manner that the farmer is griping. Not at all. When the farmer observes the share which he receives for his product when delivered to the consumer is shrinking while his costs are going higher and the sale of his product showing little advance in price, if any, then there must be something wrong with our economy.

I think the whole matter can be summed up by stating that all the farmer really wants is a fair price for his labor and his product in the market place on the basis of what he is required to pay for the things he needs to buy.

Again, without offering criticism, just do not forget there are other groups and segments who, in recent years, are recipients of big sums of Government money. For instance, a report has recently been published indicating \$6½ billion for business during the period from 1949 to 1956. The shipping industry, for example, will get millions during this year. Billions of dollars are being expended to assist people of other countries. I mention these only to indicate that, whether you favor this legislation or not, the farmer's share of this kind of expenditure, whether you call it subsidy or by any other name, is not as great as would seem when compared with other such expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have listened for 12 years and especially for the last 2 days about land banks, soil banks, food banks and so forth. I want to know when we are going to talk about some coal banks once in a while. You farm boys are all worried about land banks, but if you will come up into my district I have hundreds of land banks, and so has Mr. FENTON, higher than the dome on this Capitol and if you will take them away you can have them free.

You talk about the underemployed farmers. I do not like to see people underemployed, but I have 20,000 coal miners that are not employed at all. You say the farmers income is down 25 percent, my coal miners have no income at all. That is bad, too. I have been out at the coffee bar here with the boys from Chicago, Pittsburgh, and Detroit. These farmers will not even buy you a cup of coffee. I get bowlegged around here voting for cows, horses, wheat, corn, and whatnot, but you know coal is really entitled to be in this bill because anthracite coal is nothing but carbonized and oxidized vegetation; however, the Parliamentarian says it is not germane and I cannot get a piece of this farm subsidy. When I come down here with these men from the coalfield, and there are not many of them, and say, "Please, when

you talk about subsidies, think about these dozens of thousands of coal miners who are out of work," and see if we cannot warm your cold hearts here in our behalf once in a while.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, when H. R. 12 was before the conference it contained a provision that had to do with exports of cotton. The amendment was introduced by Senator EASTLAND, of Mississippi, and was approved by the Senate. It directed the Secretary of Agriculture to move cotton into export channels at competitive prices. The conferees struck out this amendment and placed language in the committee report expressing the attitude of Congress that the Secretary had the authority to do just that and that he should exercise that authority to move cotton into export channels at competitive prices. It was hoped by the Congress and by the conferees that he would move 5 million bales of cotton annually under that program. Now we learn that the Secretary has asked for bids on 600,000 bales of cotton today, not at competitive prices, oh, no, but at 27.5 cents a pound at the warehouse. It costs three quarters of a cent to get it to the port, which makes it 28.5 cents, whereas cotton under the recent 1 million bale program which was most successful moved at 25.5 cents a pound. Congress directed him to move cotton at competitive prices. He is breaking faith with this Congress and most important the cotton farmer. I do hope something can be done to move this cotton. The Secretary of Agriculture asked for bids on 600,000 bales. Only 6,400 bales were actually sold. This type of a program will not work; it is unrealistic and will not get results.

I would like to include at this point a telegram which was sent me by H. R. Adams, executive vice president of Agricultural Council of Arkansas, regarding this matter. The telegram is as follows:

WEST MEMPHIS, ARK., May 3, 1956.

Hon. E. C. GATHINGS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Secretary of Agriculture Benson has broken faith with farmers and intent of Congress by offering CCC cotton well above competitive world prices. Although bids were placed for 600,000 bales only 6,400 were sold. It appears administration making whipping boys out of southern cotton farmers. This is a serious matter and vigorous protest should be made.

HARVEY ADAMS,
Executive Vice President, Agricultural Council of Arkansas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the House to the same matter that the gentleman from Arkansas mentioned. On yesterday the action of the Department of Agriculture in connection with the cotton-export program was a complete breach of faith relative to the program that had been outlined previously by the Secretary of Agriculture. Unless this action is reversed or modified in some

fashion so as to bring about an actual competitive sales program, the Secretary will have completely broken his word to the cotton farmers of this country. It is not a question of interpretation. It is a question of whether or not he is going to do what he said he would do.

Only yesterday the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. COOLEY, and the ranking minority member, Mr. HOPE, made clear on the floor here the congressional intent that this competitive sales program be carried out. In response to a question which I asked, they both pointed out that it was the understanding of the committee that the Secretary had full authority to carry out a competitive program that would bring about exports of at least 5 million bales per year.

I am sure that if leaders of the Congress had not accepted the Secretary's word that such a program would be carried out under existing authority, specific language would have been included in this bill making it law.

Unless this situation is clarified immediately, I hope that the other body will write the provision into law. If the executive department cannot be relied upon to carry out commitments which have been made, the Congress should specifically spell out in detail our whole program.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, this House has not been dilatory in passing farm legislation. Day after tomorrow, it will have been a year since the House passed H. R. 12. Had that bill been passed by the Senate immediately and signed by the President, the American farmer would not find himself in the depressed condition he is in today.

The House had no further opportunity to act on farm legislation until H. R. 12 was passed by the Senate on March 16, 1956. The bill was then reported to the conferees, who reconciled the differences between the House and Senate versions to the best of their ability. On April 11, both House and Senate accepted the report of the conferees and H. R. 12 went to the President. We who believed in good farm legislation hoped and believed the President would sign this farm bill, and were greatly surprised and sorely disappointed when it met with his veto.

It would be well for the House to consider what has happened to the American farmer since 1952. Maybe it is just a coincident, but the same coincident came about in 1922 that has been having its counterpart between 1952 and the present time. It seems that these things come to pass whenever a Democratic administration is replaced by a Republican administration.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-two was the first year in a 13-year period that the food and fiber produced on the American farm did not sell for an average price equal to 100 percent or more of parity. But in 1953 farmers' prices

fell below parity and that parity ratio has fallen lower and lower each year until it now stands at 80 percent.

The average price of hogs in 1952 equaled 100 percent of parity, but during November and December of 1955, hogs sold for only 50 percent of parity. In 1952 grade A milk delivered in Kansas City sold for \$6 per hundredweight and the average price to consumers during this period was 20 cents per quart, but during 1955 the same grade A milk delivered in Kansas City brought the producer \$4 per hundredweight, although the average price to consumers was raised to 21 cents per quart.

Notwithstanding the fact that the prices of farm products were falling, thus curtailing the farmers' purchasing power and in some cases actually driving him off his farm, the cost of living was only four-tenths of 1 percent under the all-time high.

During this same period, 1952 to 1955, the prices of industrial stocks rose 62 percent; corporate profits after taxes were up 32 percent; stockholders dividends were up 19 percent; nonfarm net income was up 14 percent, but net farm income was down 23 percent. During this same period per capita income of nonfarm people rose from \$1,836 to \$1,919, a raise of \$83, but farm net income derived from farming fell from \$675 to \$551, showing a loss of \$124 in their per capita incomes.

Much has been said about the subsidy paid to the American farmer, but a check of the record will reveal the fact that between 1933 and 1955, Government subsidies to manufacturers totaled \$40.8 billion. Government subsidy to shipping accounted for almost \$5 billion; while the cost to the Government for the farm price-support program over that entire period was only \$1.2 billion. When total subsidies for all groups are considered over the past 50 years, only \$5 out of every \$1,000 paid in subsidy has gone to the American farmer.

This is by no means all the picture. The farmer has been driven more deeply into debt during the last 3½ years. In 1952 farmers owed banks \$3.05 billion, but on January 1, 1956, the farmer owed banks \$4.7 billion, a rise of \$1.65 billion since 1952. The mortgage debt against farm real estate has risen \$2.44 billion during the same period. According to Agricultural Statistics and the Agricultural Marketing Service, real estate inventory is down \$4.5 billion; livestock inventory down \$7.5 billion, and there is a loss of \$12 billion in income that he would have received had his annual income remained as high as it was in 1952.

Now, what does all this mean—he has increased his debt \$4.09 billion; he has lost \$12 billion in inventory value and another \$12 billion in income, making a total loss since 1952 of more than \$28 billion, and this during a time when many other industries were enjoying a fair measure of prosperity.

I am glad that business, labor, and industry does have the measure of prosperity they are now enjoying, but parity prices for the food and fiber produced on the American farm is even-handed justice, and the hard-working men and women who feed and clothe this country

both in time of war and time of peace, deserve the same measure of prosperity. If their purchasing power could be restored to parity, they would furnish the best market in the world for the products of industry and labor.

Take that \$12 billion loss in income as an example. Think of the building material, fencing, paint, automobiles, trucks, tractors, combines, refrigerators, television sets, and the thousand and one other articles used by the American farm family that could and would have been purchased with that \$12 billion had the farmer received it to spend.

Prosperity cannot long endure in the city if bankruptcy prevails on the farm. That was tried in the late twenties and early thirties with disastrous results.

If this income loss to the farmers had been passed on in lower prices to the city worker, it might have had some justification, but this has not been the case. The cost of living to the city worker, as I have said before, is still less than 1 percent below the all time high.

If the President had signed H. R. 12 immediately after it was approved by Congress, we would have had a good farm law in effect almost a month ago. But the President chose to disregard the fact that the House had passed this measure with a majority of 56 votes, that the Senate passed it with a majority of 15 votes, that the majority of both the House and Senate Agricultural Committees and the conferees as well, considered it good legislation. The bill before us today is only an emaciated, drawn and quartered remnant of H. R. 12. The very heart of it was removed by the Presidential veto.

The present soil bank bill contains little of benefit to the family-sized farm because on the family-sized farm, there is little or no land which can be retired from production for payments and still leave enough to pay expenses and afford a decent living for the farmer and his family. This soil bank bill is designed to aid the corporation type farm where many thousands of acres are operated under the direction of one manager. There is absolutely no limit on the amount of money which can be paid to an operator under the terms of this bill. Corporation type farms, if the acreage is extensive enough and some of them are, a single farmer could draw one-half million dollars or even \$1 million in the form of a soil bank payment. The big farmer will get the big check and the family-type farmer will wait with no check at all or one too small to be of much benefit, hoping for an increase in prices which may or may not materialize, while the mortgage takes his farm right out from under him. Then he will go to the city where he will either replace a city worker or join the ranks of the unemployed, while his farm will be incorporated into the already-too-extensive holdings of the big farmer who has been drawing the big checks and we will be one step closer to corporation-type farming and one step nearer to the elimination of the family-sized farm.

This has been happening for the past 3 years. There are 600,000 fewer farmers in the United States today than there were 3 years ago. Missouri lost 28,431

farmers during the years 1953, 1954, and 1955, and there is nothing in this bill which will reverse the trend.

The Fourth Congressional District of Missouri, which I represent, is diversified family-type farming country. During the 3-year period mentioned in the preceding paragraph, Jackson County lost 616 farmers; Henry County lost 340 farmers; Bates County lost 278 farmers; Barton County lost 243 farmers; Johnson County lost 241 farmers; Vernon County lost 224 farmers, and Lafayette County lost 106 farmers. A top adviser to Secretary Benson has said, according to press reports, that there are in the United States 2 million inefficient, submarginal farmers who should get off their farm and seek employment elsewhere. There are approximately 5 million farmers in the United States today. That means that 2 out of every 5 farm families would cease to earn a livelihood from tilling the soil.

Nothing would contribute so much to continued prosperity in our cities as parity income for the farmer. When a farmer is driven off the farm, he ceases to be a customer of the city worker and the manufacturer. He is forced to enter the city to compete with the city man for jobs that are never too plentiful.

The small business and professional men are dependent upon a prosperous agriculture for their livelihood and nothing can ruin our small towns' people as quickly as a farm depression. It was demonstrated in the early thirties that a farm depression refused to stay on the farm, and if allowed to go unchecked it would bring failure to our small town bankers, merchants, and professional people and then move on to the large cities.

I shall vote for this so-called soil-bank bill on final rollcall and shall vote against any moves to recommit it to the committee because it is all we can hope to get under present conditions. It is not good farm legislation, but half a loaf is better than no bread at all. It will be remembered that this Congress did all it possibly could to provide the American farmer with adequate legislation and only a Presidential veto prevented the farmer from receiving it.

It will also be remembered that Secretary Benson hurried down to Atlanta, Ga., with his court of jesters, used all the influence he possessed in inducing the President to veto a good farm bill, and the responsibility for the chaos rests, first, with the President of the United States for his veto of H. R. 12, and secondly, with the Secretary of Agriculture for recommending and insisting upon that veto.

It would be more than useless to send this bill back to the committee, because if the committee rewrote it and made it a good farm measure again, it would necessarily contain the provisions to which the Secretary of Agriculture and the President both so violently opposed.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to express my hearty approval of section 203 of this new farm bill, H. R. 10875, which places squarely on the shoulders of the President of the United States the responsibility to negotiate with representatives of foreign gov-

ernments in an effort to obtain agreements limiting the exports from such countries and the importation into the United States of any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom or textiles or textile products which could prove harmful to American agriculture and industry.

In my congressional district of North Carolina there are many textile mills, and from these mills comes the livelihood of many thousands of my constituents. I am hearing from millowners and operators in all sections of my district that the present rate of textile imports into this country from Japan is having a very disastrous effect on our textile industry, and unless the present national administration takes effective action to change this situation, we will soon be hearing of many textile-mill failures.

This bill, which we are voting for here today, Mr. Speaker, will place the responsibility for this textile import situation exactly where it belongs; namely, on the President. As the Chief Executive, he is in the best position to size up the extent of our textile problem from time to time and adjust or shut off the flow of foreign imports into this country which will adversely affect our domestic textile industry.

I gladly vote for and support section 203 of H. R. 10875, and upon the passage of this bill by Congress, I urge the national administration to take prompt and affirmative action to implement section 203 and bring about the protection which our American textile industry so badly needs.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, as one of the original sponsors of soil-bank legislation, I wish to add my voice in support of this legislation. This appears to be the sound approach to the problem confronting us today. The agriculture industry obviously is not receiving its fair share of the national economy. We are all striving to solve this problem so that agriculture can have a more equitable share of the national income. The "booming prosperity" has certainly failed to reach the farmers in my area. We are confronted with vast surpluses and are continuing to produce more than we are consuming or more than we can consume. This production must be controlled and it is obvious that legislation is necessary in this totally unorganized industry if we are to control this production. In my opinion, the soil-bank program with the conservation reserve and acreage reserve program could accomplish this goal. I am confident that this approach is correct morally as well as economically. It will permit us to conserve our natural resources by restoring our land. At the same time, it would be taking land out of cultivation which normally would be contributing to the surplus problem. In this way we would be conserving our soil for some future date when we will be consuming all we can produce—and that day is not in the too distant future. Therefore, I strongly support this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to state that I also support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], as the inclusion of graz-

ing lands would conform with the principle of a soil-bank program. This amendment would expand the soil-bank program and would certainly have the effect of reducing the amount of meat being marketed, and, therefore, it would have a stabilizing effect on the agriculture industry. I believe that the soil-bank approach is the only means available for solving the farmers problems today with the exception of, perhaps, a direct subsidy. I have always been opposed to subsidies of any kind, and, therefore, I am not sympathetic to a direct subsidy program at this time. President Eisenhower's proposal, which is being offered in the form of an amendment, in my opinion, is a direct subsidy which is to be paid to the farmers before the money is due. In my opinion, this would be the same as paying the farmers for their grain and produce before they planted the seed. This amendment is obviously political, and, therefore, I am constrained to oppose the amendment. I do hope that the soil-bank bill we are considering is passed, as I feel it will tend to correct the problems confronting our agriculture industry today.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. If there are no further amendments to be offered, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRIEST, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10875) to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956 pursuant to House Resolution 492, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Albert amendment and on the Abernethy amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put the other amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALBERT:

Page 5, line 5, after the period at the end of the sentence insert "In addition to the foregoing, the Secretary is authorized and directed to formulate and carry out during the years 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959 an acreage reserve program for grazing lands under which farmers or ranchers will be compensated for reducing their acreages of grazing lands and making a corresponding reduction in livestock units below a representative period designated by the Secretary. All the provisions of this title not inconsistent therewith shall apply to the grazing lands acreage reserve program."

Page 9, line 17, strike out the period and insert ", including grazing lands."

Page 9, line 24, strike out "or", insert a comma, and insert after "acres," the words "or other standards."

Page 12, line 4, after "\$23,000,000", insert "grazing lands, \$50,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 199, nays 195, answered "present" 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 39]

YEA—199

Abbitt	Gary	Patman
Abernethy	Gathings	Perkins
Addonizio	Gordon	Pfost
Albert	Granahan	Plicher
Alexander	Gray	Poage
Andrews	Green, Oreg.	Polk
Anfuso	Green, Pa.	Powell
Ashmore	Hagen	Preston
Aspinall	Hardy	Price
Bailey	Harris	Priest
Barrett	Harrison, Va.	Quigley
Bass, Tenn.	Hays, Ark.	Rabaut
Belcher	Hays, Ohio	Rees, Kans.
Bell	Healey	Reuss
Bennett, Fla.	Hollifield	Rhodes, Ariz.
Blatnik	Holland	Rhodes, Pa.
Boggs	Horan	Richards
Bolling	Huddleston	Riley
Bonner	Hull	Rivers
Bowler	Ikard	Roberts
Brooks, La.	Jarman	Robeson, Va.
Brooks, Tex.	Jennings	Rodino
Brown, Ga.	Johnson, Wis.	Rogers, Colo.
Burdick	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Fla.
Burleson	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Tex.
Burnside	Jones, N. C.	Rooney
Byrne, Pa.	Karsten	Roosevelt
Cannon	Kee	Rutherford
Carnahan	Kelley, Pa.	Selden
Celler	Kelly, N. Y.	Shelley
Chelf	Keogh	Sheppard
Christopher	Kilday	Shuford
Chudoff	Kilgore	Sleminski
Clark	King, Calif.	Sikes
Colmer	Kirwan	Sisk
Cooley	Klein	Smith, Kans.
Cooper	Kluczynski	Smith, Miss.
Davidson	Knutson	Smith, Va.
Davis, Ga.	Landrum	Spence
Davis, Tenn.	Lanham	Staggers
Dawson, Ill.	Lankford	Steed
Deane	Lesinski	Sullivan
Dempsey	Long	Teague, Tex.
Denton	McCarthy	Thomas
Dies	McCormack	Thompson, La.
Diggs	McDowell	Thompson, N. J.
Dingell	McMillan	Thompson, Tex.
Dollinger	Machrowicz	Thomson, Wyo.
Dorn, S. C.	Mack, Ill.	Thornberry
Dowdy	Madden	Trimble
Doyle	Magnuson	Tuck
Durham	Mahon	Tumulty
Eberharter	Marshall	Udall
Edmondson	Metcalf	Vinson
Elliott	Millis	Walter
Engle	Morgan	Watts
Evins	Moss	Wickersham
Fascell	Moulder	Wier
Feighan	Multer	Williams, Miss.
Fernandez	Murray, Ill.	Williams, N. J.
Fisher	Murray, Tenn.	Winstead
Flood	Natcher	Wright
Flynt	Norrell	Young
Forand	O'Brien, Ill.	Zablocki
Forrester	O'Brien, N. Y.	Zelenko
Fountain	O'Hara, Ill.	
Frazier	O'Neill	

NAYS—195

Adair	Berry	Church
Alger	Betts	Clevenger
Allen, Calif.	Boland	Coon
Allen, Ill.	Bolton	Corbett
Andersen,	Frances P.	Coudert
H. Carl	Bolton,	Cramer
Andersen,	Oliver P.	Cretella
August H.	Bosch	Crumpacker
Arends	Bow	Cunningham
Ashley	Boyle	Curtis, Mass.
Auchincloss	Bray	Curtis, Mo.
Avery	Brown, Ohio	Dague
Ayres	Broyhill	Davis, Wis.
Baker	Budge	Dawson, Utah
Baldwin	Bush	Delaney
Bass, N. H.	Byrnes, Wis.	Devereux
Bates	Canfield	Dixon
Baumhart	Carrigg	Dodd
Beamer	Cederberg	Dolliver
Becker	Chase	Dondero
Bennett, Mich.	Chenoweth	Donohue
Bentley	Chiperfield	Donovan

Dorn, N. Y.
Ellsworth
Fallon
Fenton
Fino
Fjare
Fogarty
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Gamble
Gavin
Gentry
George
Gross
Hale
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Harrison, Nebr.
Harvey
Hébert
Henderson
Heselson
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Holmes
Holt
Holtzman
Hope
Hosmer
Hyde
Jackson
James
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Jonas
Judd
Kean

Kearney
Keating
Kilburn
King, Pa.
Knox
Krueger
Laird
Latham
LeCompte
Lipscomb
Love
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McIntire
McVey
Macdonald
Mack, Wash.
Mailliard
Martin
Mason
Meador
Morrow
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Minshall
Morano
Mumma
Nicholson
Norblad
O'Konski
Osmer
Ostertag
Patterson
Pelly
Phillips
Pillion
Poff
Prouty
Radwan
Reece, Tenn.

Riehlman
Robison, Ky.
Rogers, Mass.
Sadlak
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott
Scrivner
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Sheehan
Short
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Mich.
Tollefson
Utt
Vanik
Van Zandt
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Withrow
Wolverton
Yates
Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Garmatz

NOT VOTING—38

Barden
Blitch
Boykin
Brownson
Buckley
Byrd
Carlyle
Chatham
Cole
Derounian
Grant
Gregory
Griffiths

Gubser
Gwinn
Haley
Hayworth
Herlong
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Jenkins
Kearns
Lane
Matthews
Miller, Calif.
Mollohan

Morrison
Nelson
O'Hara, Minn.
Passman
Rains
Reed, N. Y.
Simpson, Pa.
Van Pelt
Whitten
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Wolcott

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hayworth for, with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania against.
Mr. Gregory for, with Mr. Jenkins against.
Mrs. Griffiths for, with Mr. Derounian against.
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Kearns against.
Mr. Haley for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.
Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Van Pelt against.
Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Gubser against.
Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Williams of New York against.
Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Gwinn against.
Mr. Passman for, with Mr. Wolcott against.
Mrs. Blitch for, with Mr. Garmatz against.
Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Reed of New York against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Grant with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Byrd with Mr. Brownson.
Mr. Matthews with Mr. Cole.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentlewoman from Georgia. If she were present she would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Messrs. FORAND, ROGERS of Florida, FASCELL, and POWELL changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. KNOX, DAWSON of Utah, BERRY, DIXON, KRUEGER, and COON changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 51, after line 17, insert a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 309. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the level of price support for the 1956 crop of upland cotton shall be not less than 84 percent of the parity price thereof."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas, 186, nays 208, answered "present" 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—186

Abbutt
Abernethy
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Andrews
Anfuso
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bailey
Barrett
Bass, Tenn.
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Bonner
Bowler
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Burdick
Burleson
Burnside
Byrne, Pa.
Cannon
Carnahan
Celler
Chelf
Christopher
Chudoff
Clark
Colmer
Cooley
Cooper
Davidson
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.
Deane
Dempsey
Denton
Dies
Diggs
Dingell
Dollinger
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Doyle
Durham
Eberhart
Edmondson
Elliott
Engle
Evins
Feighan
Fernandez
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Forand

Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Gary
Gathings
Gentry
Granahan
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Hagen
Hardy
Harris
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Healey
Hébert
Hollfield
Holland
Huddleston
Hull
Ikard
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Karsten
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Keogh
Kilday
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Klein
Kluczynski
Knutson
Landrum
Lanham
Lankford
Lesinski
Long
McCarthy
McCormack
McDowell
McMillan
Machrowicz
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Marshall
Metcalf
Mills
Morgan
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murray, Ill.
Murray, Tenn.
Natcher

Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neill
Patman
Perkins
Pirost
Pilcher
Poage
Poik
Preston
Price
Priest
Quigley
Rabaut
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Richards
Riley
Rivers
Roberts
Robeson, Va.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rutherford
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shuford
Sieminski
Sikes
Sisk
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Tuck
Tumulty
Udall
Vinson
Walter
Watts
Whitten
Wickersham
Wier
Williams, Miss.
Winstead
Wright
Zelenko

NAYS—208

Adair
Alger
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Andersen, August H.
Arends
Ashley
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Bass, N. H.
Bates
Baumhart
Beamer
Becker
Belcher
Bennett, Mich.
Bentley
Berry
Betts
Boland
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bosch
Bow
Boyle
Bray
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill
Budge
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Carrigg
Cederberg
Chase
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clevenger
Cole
Coon
Corbett
Coudert
Cramer
Cretella
Crumppacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Utah
Delaney
Devereux
Dixon
Dodd
Dolliver
Dondero
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn, N. Y.
Ellsworth
Fallon
Fascell

Fenton
Fino
Fjare
Fogarty
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Gamble
Gavin
George
Gross
Hale
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Harrison, Nebr.
Harrison, Va.
Harvey
Henderson
Heselson
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Holmes
Holt
Holtzman
Hope
Horan
Hosmer
Hyde
Jackson
James
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Keating
Kelly, N. Y.
Kilburn
King, Pa.
Knox
Krueger
Laird
Latham
LeCompte
Lipscomb
Love
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McIntire
Macdonald
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Mailliard
Martin
Mason
Meador
Morrow
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Minshall

Morano
Mumma
Nicholson
Norblad
O'Konski
Osmer
Ostertag
Patterson
Pelly
Phillips
Pillion
Poff
Powell
Prouty
Radwan
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Reuss
Riehlman
Robison, Ky.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Sadlak
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott
Scrivner
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Sheehan
Short
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Mich.
Thomson, Wyo.
Tollefson
Utt
Vanik
Van Zandt
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. J.
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Withrow
Wolverton
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Garmatz

NOT VOTING—38

Barden
Blitch
Boykin
Brownson
Buckley
Byrd
Carlyle
Chatham
Curtis, Mo.
Derounian
Gordon
Grant
Gregory

Gubser
Gwinn
Haley
Hayworth
Herlong
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Jenkins
Kearns
Kirwan
Lane
Matthews

Miller, Calif.
Mollohan
Morrison
Nelson
O'Hara, Minn.
Passman
Rains
Simpson, Pa.
Van Pelt
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Wolcott

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania against.
Mr. Gregory for, with Mr. Jenkins against.
Mrs. Griffiths for, with Mr. Derounian against.
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Kearns against.

Mr. Haley for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.
Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Van Pelt against.
Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Gubser against.
Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Williams of New York against.
Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Gwinn against.
Mr. Carlyle for, with Mr. Wolcott against.
Mrs. Blitch for, with Mr. Garmatz against.
Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Curtis of Missouri against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Grant with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Brownson.
Mr. Byrd with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentlewoman from Georgia, Mrs. BLITCH. If she were present she would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MORANO. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MORANO moves that the bill be recommitment to the Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report the bill back forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 25, line 2, after "116" insert "(a)".
Line 8, after the end of the section insert a new subsection as follows:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and in order to assist the producer in financing his farming operations, and caring for and improving his farm property, the Secretary may make an advance payment to the producer of not to exceed 50 percent of the compensation which will become due the producer under his contract to participate in the acreage-reserve program; and may in any year make an advance payment to the producer of not to exceed 40 percent of the annual payment for such year which would become due the producer under his contract to participate in the conservation-reserve program."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on the motion to recommit I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas, 184 nays, 211 not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

YEAS—184

Adair	Andresen,	Baker
Alger	August H.	Baldwin
Allen, Calif.	Arends	Bass, N. H.
Allen, Ill.	Auchincloss	Bates
Andersen,	Avery	Baumhart
H. Carl	Ayres	Beamer

Becker
Belcher
Bennett, Mich.
Bentley
Berry
Betts
Bolton,
Frances P.
Bolton,
Oliver P.
Bosch
Bow
Bray
Brooks, La.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill
Budge
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Carrigg
Cederberg
Chase
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clevenger
Cole
Coon
Corbett
Coudert
Cramer
Cretella
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Utah
Devereux
Dixon
Dolliver
Dondero
Dorn, N. Y.
Ellsworth
Fenton
Fino
Fjare
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Gamble
Gavin
George
Gross
Hale
Halleck
Hand

Harden
Harrison, Nebr.
Harvey
Henderson
Heseltun
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Holmes
Holt
Hope
Horan
Hosmer
Hyde
Jackson
James
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Jonas
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Keating
Kilburn
Knox
Krueger
Laird
Latham
LeCompte
Lipscomb
Lovre
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McIntire
McVey
Mack, Wash.
Mailliard
Martin
Meador
Merrow
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Minshall
Morano
Mumma
Nicholson
Norblad
O'Konski
Osmers
Ostertag

NAYS—211

Abbitt
Abernethy
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Andrews
Anfuso
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bailey
Barrett
Bass, Tenn.
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Bowler
Boyle
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Burdick
Burleson
Burnside
Byrne, Pa.
Cannon
Carnahan
Celler
Chief
Christopher
Chudoff
Clark
Colmer
Cooley
Cooper
Davidson
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
Dies
Diggs
Dingell
Dodd
Dollinger
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Doyle
Durham
Eberhart
Edmondson
Elliott
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Felghan
Fernandez
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forand
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Friedel
Fulton
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gentry
Gordon
Granahan
Gray
Green, Ore.
Green, Pa.
Hagen
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Healey

Patterson
Pelly
Phillips
Pillion
Poff
Prouty
Radwan
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Robison, Ky.
Rogers, Mass.
Sadlak
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott
Scrivner
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Sheehan
Short
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Mich.
Thompson, Wyo.
Tollefson
Utt
Van Zandt
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Withrow
Wolverton
Young
Younger

Hébert
Hollifield
Holland
Holtzman
Huddleston
Hull
Ikard
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Karsten
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilday
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, Pa.
Klein
Kluczynski
Knutson
Landrum
Lanham
Lankford
Lesinski
McCarthy
McCormack
McDowell
McMillan
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Marshall
Mason
Metcalfe
Mills
Morgan
Moss
Moulder

Multer
Murray, Ill.
Murray, Tenn.
Natcher
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neill
Patman
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pilcher
Poage
Polk
Powell
Preston
Price
Priest
Quigley
Rabaut
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Richards

NOT VOTING—38

Barden
Blitch
Boykin
Brownson
Buckley
Byrd
Carlyle
Chatham
Curtis, Mo.
Derounian
Grant
Gregory
Griffiths

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Hayworth against.

Mr. Jenkins for, with Mr. Gregory against.

Mr. Derounian for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Kearns for, with Mr. Curtis of Missouri against.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Boykin against.

Mr. Van Pelt for, with Mr. Byrd against.

Mr. Gubser for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Williams of New York for, with Mrs. Griffiths against.

Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Rains against.

Mr. Wolcott for, with Mr. Kirwan against.

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Grant against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Brownson.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Barden with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Carlyle with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. BOSCH, Mr. BOW, and Mr. TABER changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 314, nays 78, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 42]

YEAS—314

Abbitt	Andresen,	Ayres
Abernethy	August H.	Baker
Adair	Andrews	Baldwin
Addonizio	Anfuso	Barrett
Albert	Arends	Bass, Tenn.
Alexander	Ashley	Baumhart
Allen, Calif.	Ashmore	Beamer
Allen, Ill.	Aspinall	Belcher
Andersen,	Auchincloss	Bell
H. Carl	Avery	Bennett, Fla.

Bennett, Mich.	Gross	O'Konski
Bentley	Hagen	Patman
Berry	Hale	Patterson
Betts	Halleck	Pelly
Blatnik	Harden	Perkins
Boggs	Hardy	Pfost
Boland	Harris	Pilcher
Bolling	Harrison, Nebr.	Poage
Bolton	Harrison, Va.	Poff
Frances P.	Harvey	Polk
Bolton	Hays, Ark.	Powell
Oliver P.	Hays, Ohio	Preston
Bonner	Healey	Price
Bow	Henderson	Priest
Bowler	Hill	Quigley
Boyle	Hillings	Rabaut
Bray	Hoeven	Reece, Tenn.
Brooks, La.	Hollifield	Rees, Kans.
Brooks, Tex.	Holland	Reuss
Brown, Ga.	Holmes	Rhodes, Ariz.
Brown, Ohio	Holtzman	Rhodes, Pa.
Broyhill	Hope	Richards
Budge	Horan	Riley
Burdick	Hosmer	Rivers
Burleson	Huddleston	Roberts
Burnside	Hull	Robeson, Va.
Bush	Hyde	Robison, Ky.
Byrne, Pa.	Ikard	Rodino
Byrnes, Wis.	Jarman	Rogers, Colo.
Cannon	Jennings	Rogers, Tex.
Carnahan	Jensen	Rooney
Carrigg	Johansen	Roosevelt
Cederberg	Johnson, Calif.	Rutherford
Celler	Johnson, Wis.	Sadlak
Chase	Jonas	Schenck
Chelf	Jones, Ala.	Schwengel
Chenoweth	Jones, Mo.	Scrivner
Chipperfield	Jones, N. C.	Scudder
Christopher	Judd	Seely-Brown
Chudoff	Karsten	Selden
Church	Kee	Sheehan
Clark	Kelley, Pa.	Shelley
Colmer	Keogh	Sheppard
Cooley	Kilday	Shuford
Coon	Kilgore	Sieminski
Cooper	King, Calif.	Sikes
Cunningham	Klein	Siler
Davidson	Kluczynski	Simpson, Ill.
Davis, Ga.	Knox	Sisk
Davis, Tenn.	Knutson	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Wis.	Krueger	Smith, Miss.
Dawson, Ill.	Laird	Smith, Va.
Dawson, Utah	Landrum	Smith, Wis.
Deane	Lanham	Spence
Dempsey	Lanford	Springer
Denton	LeCompte	Staggers
Devereux	Lesinski	Steed
Dies	Lipscomb	Sullivan
Diggs	Long	Talle
Dingell	Lovre	Thomas
Dixon	McCarthy	Thompson, La.
Dodd	McCormack	Thompson,
Dollinger	McCulloch	Mich.
Dolliver	McDonough	Thompson, N. J.
Dondero	McDowell	Thompson, Tex.
Dorn, S. C.	McGregor	Thomson, Wyo.
Dowdy	McIntire	Thornberry
Doyle	McMillan	Tollefson
Durham	McVey	Trimble
Eberhart	Machrowicz	Tuck
Edmondson	Mack, Ill.	Tumulty
Elliott	Mack, Wash.	Vanik
Ellsworth	Madden	Velde
Engle	Magnuson	Vinson
Evins	Mahon	Vursell
Feighan	Mailliard	Walter
Fenton	Marshall	Watts
Fernandez	Martin	Weaver
Fisher	Mason	Westland
Fjare	Meador	Whitten
Flood	Metcaif	Wickersham
Flynt	Miller, Md.	Widnall
Fogarty	Miller, Nebr.	Wier
Forand	Mills	Wigglesworth
Ford	Minshall	Williams, Miss.
Forrester	Morgan	Williams, N. J.
Fountain	Moss	Wilson, Ind.
Frazier	Moulder	Winstead
Frelinghuysen	Multer	Withrow
Gathings	Murray, Ill.	Wright
Gentry	Murray, Tenn.	Yates
George	Natcher	Young
Gordon	Nicholson	Younger
Granahan	Norblad	Zablocki
Gray	Norrell	Zelenko
Green, Oreg.	O'Brien, Ill.	
Green, Pa.	O'Hara, Ill.	

NAYS—78

Alger	Clevenger	Crumpacker
Bass, N. H.	Cole	Curtis, Mass.
Bates	Corbett	Dague
Becker	Coudert	Delaney
Bosch	Cramer	Donohue
Canfield	Cretella	Donovan

Dorn, N. Y.	Keating	Ray
Fallon	Kelly, N. Y.	Reed, N. Y.
Fascell	Kilburn	Riehlman
Fino	King, Pa.	Rogers, Fla.
Friedel	Latham	Rogers, Mass.
Fulton	McConnell	St. George
Gamble	Macdonald	Saylor
Garnatz	Morrow	Scherer
Gary	Miller, N. Y.	Scott
Gavin	Morano	Short
Hand	Mumma	Taber
Hébert	O'Brien, N. Y.	Taylor
Heslton	O'Neill	Teague, Calif.
Hiestand	Osmer	Udall
Hinshaw	Ostertag	Utt
Holt	Philbin	Van Zandt
Jackson	Phillips	Wainwright
James	Pillion	Wharton
Kean	Prouty	Wilson, Calif.
Kearney	Radwan	Wolverton

NOT VOTING—41

Bailey	Gubser	Mollohan
Barden	Gwinn	Morrison
Blitch	Haley	Nelson
Boykin	Hayworth	O'Hara, Minn.
Brownson	Herlong	Passman
Buckley	Hess	Rains
Byrd	Hoffman, Ill.	Simpson, Pa.
Carlyle	Hoffman, Mich.	Teague, Tex.
Chatham	Jenkins	Van Pelt
Curtis, Mo.	Kearns	Vorrs
Derounian	Kirwan	Williams, N. Y.
Grant	Lane	Willis
Gregory	Matthews	Wolcott
Griffiths	Miller, Calif.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Jenkins for, with Mr. Curtis of Missouri against.
Mr. Gregory for, with Mr. Gwinn against.
Mrs. Blitch for, with Mr. Herlong against.
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Hess against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Carlyle with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Matthews with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Derounian.
Mr. Borden with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Brownson.
Mr. Hayworth with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.
Mr. Haley with Mr. Vorrs.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Williams of New York.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Messrs. JACKSON and HINSHAW changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BANK PROTECTION FOR FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the existing flood-control laws relating to the Federal Government's jurisdiction and responsibilities as to channel improvement or channel rectification for flood control. Such flood works are for the purpose of improving the flow of waters within the river channels and to protect the river banks against erosion

with destruction to adjoining farmlands. During the early 1930's emergency funds were used for channel improvement and bank protection for flood control. With the enactment of the Flood Control Act of 1936 Federal policy on flood control was written and the jurisdiction given to the Corps of Engineers of the Army. This act provided for the use of Federal funds in cooperation with State and local agencies for the construction of flood works including channel improvement and bank protection projects but required that State and local governments would provide all lands, easements and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project, assume the obligation for any damages due to the construction works, and finally to maintain and operate all works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Corps of Engineers.

In 1938 the Congress amended the flood-control law, completely reversing its policy in regard to the responsibility of State and local governments. Under this act the Federal Government agreed to assume all costs for the construction of dams, reservoirs, channel improvement, and bank protection including the assumption of damages connected with the construction works, the securing of lands, easements, and rights-of-way, and the responsibility of maintenance and operation of all such projects.

Thereafter, Congress in 1941 amended the flood-control law and again reversed policy in regard to bank-protection projects. This act restored the requirement of the Flood Control Act of 1936 in regard to bank-protection projects, making State or local agencies responsible for acquisition of lands, easements, or rights-of-way, for damages for the construction works, and for maintenance and operation of the completed project. These legislative changes over a period of years have produced a checkerboard of responsibility for maintenance, some of which rested upon the Federal Government and some upon State or local agencies established for flood-control purposes.

After about 20 years' experience on bank-control projects for flood control in the State of Oregon and particularly in the Willamette Valley project area, critical problems have developed which demand a reexamination of the law applying to bank-protection works. The most critical problem has developed in connection with those bank-protection projects which have been locally sponsored. Under Oregon law, landowners contiguous to the river where bank protection is needed may organize water-control districts for the purpose of securing the necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way. These water-control districts assume damages and agree to operate and maintain the projects. Experience indicates that the costs involved in the carrying out of such an arrangement have greatly exceeded the anticipated cost and are beyond the resources of the landowners in most instances.

The heavy floods in Oregon in the past winter were particularly destructive to many such bank-protection projects. The water-control districts in repeated instances found themselves obligated to

undertake what was essentially a reconstruction of the bank-protection works. Such was clearly a financial impossibility. Had it not been for Public Law 99 of the 84th Congress the situation insofar as bank protection was concerned in the Willamette Valley would be chaotic. The engineers have determined that emergency flood-control funds may be used to reconstruct and rebuild such projects.

A more serious situation faces this area for the future. In view of the fact that experience demonstrates that ordinary maintenance and operation of bank-control projects is beyond the financial ability of water-control districts, the highly essential remaining projects may not be undertaken. At the same time with the completion of flood-control dams and reservoirs the flowage of impounded waters from the reservoirs at or near bankful levels for long periods of time produce greater bank erosion than do uncontrolled floods over bank stage where the high-water conditions do not exist for so long a period of time.

The purpose of the bill which I have introduced is in effect to restore the terms of the 1938 Flood Control Act so that it applies to bank-protection works the same as it applies to flood-control dams and reservoirs. The single exception to the restoration of the language of the 1938 act being that local sponsors still will be required to furnish the lands, easements, and rights-of-way.

Approval of the bill will eliminate the checkerboard pattern as to responsibility for maintenance and operation of such projects so that the Army engineers having full responsibility may operate a coordinated maintenance program for this purpose. It will assure that bank protection will be provided where needed and where local sponsorship is presently a financial impossibility.

This problem, I am sure, is not limited to the State of Oregon but likewise is present in connection with some of the other major flood-control developments in the Nation. This matter is urgent and remedial legislation is necessary if we are to avoid a more costly problem of correction in the future.

NATIONAL FOREST TIMBER RESOURCE OPERATIONS

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, since I have been a Member of Congress, I have served on the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling funds for the Forest Service and also have served as a member of the Subcommittee on Forestry of the House Agriculture Committee. In my work I have oftentimes found that the material available from the Forest Service on the management of our Federal forest resources has not been as adequate as it should be. There needs to be a greater concentration of effort in the managing of our timber resources in

order to eliminate the possibilities of timber waste, insect infestations, disease epidemics, and fire hazards. The waste of taxpayers' dollars through deterioration of timber, insect infestation, and fire has not been in keeping with sound forestry practices.

The year 1955 marked the golden anniversary of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture. For 50 years vast areas of our country's forest lands have been under the supervision of that Bureau of our Government. Today the 181 million acres of national forests located in 40 States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico represent big business—a business so large that thousands of employees and \$65 million to \$70 million of annual appropriations are expended in their operation.

Approximately 85 million acres of the national forests are classified as commercial timberland—land that is suitable for the growing of timber. On these Federal lands is found over one-third of all sawtimber growing in the United States. Every year timber is harvested in large amounts for lumber, plywood, pulpwood, poles, piling, railroad ties, and a variety of other uses. Thousands of sawmills and other forest products plants depend in whole or in part on this timber.

Income from the sale of timber on the national forests in 1955 was over \$73 million, representing 91 percent of all income received. Had all the timber harvested been converted into lumber for house construction, it would have been sufficient to build 633,000 average-size homes. An increase in the quantity of timber harvested and the income from such timber is anticipated for the current fiscal year. In spite of these large incomes, however, they do not exceed the costs of administration when payments to the States in lieu of taxes are included as part of such costs.

The 149 national forests contain about 770 billion board-feet of timber of sawlog size. In the West there are large areas of virgin timber on the national forests. Some of this timber is mature or overage and is putting on little or no growth or is deteriorating. Often such timber becomes the breeding ground for insect infestations and disease epidemics. Often, too, dead or dying trees in the stand create a high fire hazard. It is generally agreed that more of this type of timber should be harvested. When properly harvested, the soil has opportunity for producing a new timber crop. In the eastern national forests many young timber stands are in need of thinning and pulpwood cutting, if they are to prove good growth in volume and quality.

There has been improvement of recent years in the management of the national forests for timber production. There is much room for additional improvement, however, to put more of these forests on a par with the better managed privately-owned forests. There needs to be a greater concentration of effort by the Forest Service on the job of managing the timber resource. Only on a minor number of the national forests is the harvesting of timber up to the allowable sustained yield cut and on only a few national forests is the forest

soil producing a maximum of wood increment. Our expanding population and growing economy demand the best economic use of this forest soil. Concomitant benefits flow from good forest management and proper timber harvesting. These include the increased production of clear and usable water for irrigation and municipal purposes, silt-free streams for good fishing, a better habitat for game, and the development of more accessible and better appearing forests for recreational enjoyment.

Each year the Congress is asked to consider the fiscal needs of the national forests. Each year committees of the House and Senate are asked to consider legislation affecting the national forests. Many of these requests or proposals relate to timber resource management. Testimony of witnesses or filed statements must serve the Congress and its committees as the basis of enlightenment—generalized or limited in scope as they frequently may be. Annual administrative reports, when available, have been notably lacking in the type of information here proposed for assembly and reporting.

H. R. 10794 would provide for an annual report to the Congress on the administration of the national forests with special reference to timber resources. The measure would provide for the first time a running record of all activities, operations and facts pertaining to timber management for each of the 149 national forests. The information would be immediately useful and over a period of years would provide an increasingly valuable index of progress in the management of the national forests. The reports would favorably influence the efforts made to improve the management of such forests. They would greatly assist the Appropriations and other committees of Congress and their staffs in analyzing the need for funds and the effect of proposed legislation. Specifically, H. R. 10794 would require the Department of Agriculture to compile information for each fiscal year and for each national forest which would show, first, the area within each national forest under the jurisdiction of the Secretary; second, the total forest area within each national forest under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, and the estimated quantity of timber thereon; third, the portion of the total forested area within each national forest which is suitable and available for commercial timber production, and the estimated quantity of timber on such commercially forested area; fourth, the allowable annual timber cut on such commercially forested area within each national forest consistent with sustained-yield timber management; fifth, the quantity of timber actually cut on such commercially forested area within each national forest; sixth, the estimated annual average timber growth rate in board feet per acre of the commercially valuable timber on such commercially forested area within each national forest; seventh, the total receipts from sales of timber and other forest products, and the total of all other receipts, for each national forest; eighth, the total of expenditures and obligations with respect

to each national forest, and the portion thereof attributable to timber resource operations, including management, protection, and development of timber resources; ninth, the total number of permanent employees, and the total number of temporary employees, for each national forest on the last day of such fiscal year, and the number of such employees engaged in timber resource operations; and tenth, the number of miles of timber access roads in each national forest and the number of additional miles of such roads necessary for timber resource operations.

Section 2 of the measure would provide for an annual report to Congress of this information and a summarization by States, national forest regions, and for the United States.

Most of the data that would be reported under this measure is already a matter of record in the headquarters offices of each national forest. In several national forest regions some of the data are published for annual distribution. Some of the data are now transmitted to the Washington, D. C., office of the Forest Service where it is compiled for analysis and official use. If this measure is enacted, therefore, it will not require much additional work for the Department of Agriculture to comply with its provisions. Furthermore, the results will be very helpful to the Department in further analyzing its forest management problems and progress.

THE UNIQUE CONTRIBUTION OF RAILROAD WORKERS

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the railroad-retirement amendments of 1956 which, for the first time since 1951, would provide an increase in the amount of benefits paid under our Railroad Retirement System. Under the bill most benefits would be increased by around 15 percent, to bring payments under our railroad plan more into line with present costs of living. The need for such an increase is obvious, when we consider that the average payment received by retired railroad workers today is only \$104 a month; that the average disability payment is only \$95 a month, and that averages for survivor benefits range from only \$40 to \$62 a month.

Surely these amounts are inadequate to maintain even a subsistence standard of living at today's living costs. Indeed, a 15 percent increase seems to be hardly enough. The reason for the proposed increase in this amount, however, arises from the very integrity of the railroad retirement system itself. For, as you know, the position of the Railroad Brotherhoods has always been that theirs would be a self-financing system. It follows that the increase in benefits is also reflected in an increase in the

contribution which each railroad worker will pay into the system. The present bill calls for an increase of 1 percent each on the tax contribution of employers and employees to carry the cost of these benefit increases, and to maintain the self-sufficient status of the system. To ease the burden of this increase on active railroad employees the bill also carries a provision which allows them to exclude the amount of their retirement contribution from income and wages for income-tax purposes.

Mr. Speaker, in considering this legislation I am convinced that we must bear in mind the great contributions to national development which railroad workers have made as they have carved their unique role in American history. For in their role as transporters of our food and fiber, and of the product of our factories and our farms, they have helped to make us a united country. Today the men and women in the smallest hamlet in our land have access to everything available in the largest metropolitan centers because of our railroads. Our modern miracle of transportation has thus become also a miracle of communication that has cemented the bonds of our national community.

We must be conscious as well of the fact that railroad workers have been pioneers in the development of our American pension systems. Private company pension plans originated, in this country, in the railroad industry away back in 1874. During the years following they developed rapidly as private pension plans, through the continued concern of the railroad brotherhoods.

The experience of these railroad plans, in good times and bad, could be said, I believe, to have furnished the groundwork for all of our existing retirement plans in this country—including the Social Security Act. It was because of this unique contribution—as well as because of the special hazards of the railroad industry—and of the industry's vital importance to our national welfare that the Congress set up a separate Railroad Retirement System at about the same time that it was establishing the Social Security System for most other workers.

In the ensuing years, Congress has recognized its unique obligation to our railroad industry by approving special protections to make the railroad retirement plan a model for career systems. These changes have been made through a team approach, in which the railroad brotherhoods have worked side by side with Members of Congress in working out the kind of protection they needed—and the kind they could pay for.

I believe we must increase the amount of the benefits which railroad workers and their dependents are now receiving by at least the 15 percent provided in this bill. We must bear in mind the fact that no increases in the amount of benefits under this system have occurred since 1951, although two substantial increases have been made in social-security benefits. Railroad workers have, through the years, contributed generously so that they would have ade-

quate protection in their old age and for their families in the event of their death. They have kept faith with the Congress and the American people in this respect. Surely the American Congress must now keep faith with the railroad brotherhoods in enacting this legislation.

FURTHER JUDICIAL WEAKENING OF THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT MAKES PASSAGE OF H. R. 11 IMPORTANT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1951 the Supreme Court of the United States struck a near mortal blow to the Robinson-Patman Act. This was done by a closely divided opinion in *Standard Oil Co. (Indiana) v. Federal Trade Commission* (340 U. S. 231). Since that time the Federal Trade Commission has rained a number of additional blows onto the Robinson-Patman Act by a variety of interpretations which have aggravated and extended the wounds made by the Supreme Court.

Now comes a decision in the *Balian Ice Cream Co., Inc., against Arden Farms Co. et al.*, by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, where we find the court dancing on the grave of the Robinson-Patman Act. Following the example of the Supreme Court's *Standard of Indiana* decision, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in the *Balian* decision has engaged in promiscuous legislative findings, arrived at a conclusion as to what it thinks is good for the competitive system, and reconstructed the Robinson-Patman Act accordingly. While the Supreme Court in *Standard of Indiana* went pretty far in this direction and injected a sizeable dose of its economic theories into the law, the Ninth circuit court of appeals has compounded the injury by adding additional and even cruder economic theories.

For example, the only reason for having a law to try to curb price discrimination, as the Robinson-Patman Act does, is that this practice gives larger firms insuperable and vital advantages over smaller competitors. As for sales competition among marketers of unequal size, the practice would always permit the large interstate marketers to win out over local competitors if the big marketers cut prices only where they encounter local competition; in other words, if there is no check on ability to discriminate in price. This is for the obvious reason that price competition on this basis results in the local sellers suffering a revenue loss on all of their sales, whereas the large interstate marketer takes a revenue loss on perhaps a small fraction of its sales. Yet in the *Balian* decision the Court could see no unfair injury in the fact that certain local producers of ice cream in the Los Angeles area lost revenue, because, the Court said, the

large interstate competitor was also taking a revenue loss on its sales in that particular market. Such was the reasoning of the Court in the face of its frequent references to a finding of the lower court that the interstate marketer had not reduced its price in the several other States where it was selling ice cream.

I have pointed out only one of the instances in which the Court has misunderstood or overlooked the practical basis and the underlying reason for the law. Beyond that the Court has, I submit, misconstrued and misinterpreted the law and made holdings which go beyond, and are contrary to, the holdings of the Supreme Court on a number of points. I have set these points out in a statement which I have today filed with the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary, asking that subcommittee to add this statement to my testimony of last week on H. R. 11.

H. R. 11 was designed and introduced to close the loophole which the Supreme Court drove into the Robinson-Patman Act in the Standard Oil of Indiana case. This more recent reinterpretation and weakening of the law by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in the Balian ice cream case now makes it all the more imperative that H. R. 11 be passed, and be passed promptly.

I think the Members may be interested in my statement on the Balian ice cream decision, which is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I desire to use this opportunity to inform you and the members of your committee about an additional loophole that has been made in the Clayton antitrust law, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act. It is a loophole that was made in that law quite recently. The United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit on October 1, 1955, handed down its decision and opinion in the case of *The Balian Ice Cream Co., Inc., v. Arden Farms Co., et al.* In so doing, it in effect rendered its decisions in 15 separate cases which had been brought by small-business men as plaintiffs to protect themselves from destructive price discriminatory practices. Their actions were brought as provided for under section 4 of the Clayton Act, in which the plaintiffs claimed violation of the Federal antitrust laws. The basic claim was that each of the plaintiffs who is an independent manufacturer or distributor in the Los Angeles area, sustained injury when the large Arden Farms Co. had engaged in price discrimination tactics. The gist of the complaints was that the Arden Co. operates in the Northwest States and in Arizona, as well as in California, and that discriminations are obvious because it is charging its customers in these other States higher prices than its charges its customers in the Los Angeles area for products of like grade and quality.

The Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit decided the cases against the plaintiffs, holding that the defendant Arden had made out a defense by showing that its prices in California "were set up in good faith to meet the lawful and equally low prices of its competitors." In that connection the appellate court stated:

"The trial court made precise and exact findings covering this defense. It was found that the prices at which Arden sold its ice cream products in California were set up in good faith to meet the lawful and equally low prices of its competitors."

Counsel for the plaintiffs then petitioned the Supreme Court of the United States for writ of certiorari. The Supreme Court denied that petition. The effect of its denial

would be to leave the decision of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals as the law of the case. Moreover, since the Federal Trade Commission has the paramount jurisdiction as a Federal agency to enforce the statute in question, it must look to the decision of the Ninth Circuit for guidance in its enforcement activities.

Counsel for the plaintiffs have petitioned the Supreme Court for a rehearing on their petition for a writ of certiorari. In that connection they have pointed out to the Court that the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in its decision in the Balian case held:

1. That defendant Arden had made out a "good faith" defense, and in so doing had extended the scope of the "good faith" defense provided for by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Standard Oil Company v. United States* (340 U. S. 231).

2. That it did not overcome the "good faith" defense of defendant Arden for the plaintiffs to show that Arden had in its discrimination in price not merely met an equally low price of a competitor but had undercut its competitors.

3. That defendant Arden made out its "good faith" defense even though it had discriminated in price to eliminate a great many of the "chiseling cuts" of its competitors in the Los Angeles area.

4. That the plaintiff did not overcome Arden's "good faith" defense by showing that Arden had not discriminated to meet an equally low price of a competitor in an "individual competitive situation."

5. That Arden should be regarded as having acted in "good faith," even if Arden had gone beyond the technical limits of meeting an equally low price of a competitor on ice cream products offered for sale by its competitors to their customers, so long as it did not extend that action to include "diced ice cream" with respect to which Arden had a monopoly control in the Los Angeles market.

6. That Arden obviously did not violate section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act, as amended, by selling ice cream products at higher prices in other States than it was selling goods of like grade and quality in the Los Angeles area.

7. That there was no direct connection between Arden's discriminatory higher prices that it charged its customers in other States and the lower prices it charged its customers in the Los Angeles area; that even in geographical price discrimination cases such as this, it must be shown that different competing customers are charged different prices.

8. That a factor against the plaintiffs is the admitted fact that neither the materials nor the products sold at the discriminatory prices by Arden in the Los Angeles area are shipped in interstate commerce.

9. That "Arden did not embark upon a campaign of selling goods shipped in interstate commerce in a local area to punish or designedly try to cause loss to one weaker competitor. It had no design to eliminate such a competitor and put him out of business."

The testimony before this committee on April 18, 1956, included expression of concern from a representative of many small-business men that the decision in this Balian case continues the "whittling away" of the Clayton Antitrust Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, which was started by the Supreme Court in its decision in the *Standard of Indiana* case. (See the testimony of Mr. Henry Bison, pages 228-231, of the transcript of the hearings.)

In his testimony before this committee on April 19, 1956, the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission admitted that he had found the opinion and decision in the Balian case a "somewhat perplexing decision." (Transcript, p. 331.) He observed that he had construed the law as providing for the

application of the "good faith" defense in those instances where the defendant meets but does not undercut a competitor's price. Then it was pointed out to him that at pages 182 to 184 of its report, the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws recommends that the law should be so construed as to allow sellers to use discriminations not alone as a defense to retain a customer but also in an offensive manner to acquire new ones, even where the seller cuts his price to the favored buyer below that offered to such buyer by the seller's competitors. In that connection the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission stated that he regards that recommendation as "purely advisory." It should be noted that the report containing that recommendation had been sent by the Attorney General to the judges who comprise the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. Perhaps those judges also regard the recommendations contained in the report in the same light as the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission regards them, namely, as purely advisory. Be that as it may, it now appears that the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has, in the Balian case, demonstrated its willingness to accept and follow the advice and recommendations of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws. That is true although the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission in his testimony before this committee on April 19, 1956, at transcript page 332, stated that he clearly understands the law, even as construed by the Supreme Court in the *Standard of Indiana* case, to limit the defendant's showing in his good-faith defense to a showing that he merely met an equally low price of a competitor and did not undercut it.

What has the decision in the Balian case done in whittling away the law against discriminations which substantially lessen competition and tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce? In providing an answer to that question, I would like to summarize my understanding of the facts upon which the Balian case is founded:

1. Defendant Arden is one of the largest manufacturers and distributors of ice cream products in the United States. It is a Delaware corporation. It manufactures and sells its products in California, Oregon, and Washington. In addition, it sells and distributes its products also in Idaho and Montana.

2. Although Arden by virtue of its control of certain patents had a virtual monopoly control over a packaged individual serving of ice cream that it had designated "Diced Cream," it nevertheless did face some competition from the sale of other ice cream packaged for individual servings.

3. In the Los Angeles area Arden had a substantial share of the total market for ice cream and ice-cream products. Its share amounted to 18 and 17 percent respectively. That share was substantially more than the aggregate of the shares of all of the 15 plaintiffs who proceeded against Arden because of its discriminations in price and who lost their suits by virtue of the decision in the Balian case.

4. Arden, in order to retain its customers and to gain new ones, cut its prices on ice-cream products other than its monopoly product, Diced Cream, to meet or undercut prices of its local competitors in the Los Angeles area, while charging higher prices in other areas for goods of like grade and quality.

5. The business of Arden and of its ice cream distributing subsidiaries in selling ice-cream products was "substantially and adversely affected by competitive conditions."

6. The circuit court pointed out that while Arden's local competitors in the Los Angeles area claimed they had been injured by loss of revenue, Arden had lost revenue on its sales in the Los Angeles area; and from these facts the court appears to have reasoned

that there were no competitive consequences about which the statute is concerned; and that "any revenue loss to the plaintiffs as a result of the lowering of prices is merely one of the results of local competition."

7. Finally, the circuit court made this astonishing interpretation of the Robinson-Patman Act:

"The statute requires that there be some discrimination."

The circuit court proceeded on the theory that since the customers of Arden who were paying it different prices were not competing with each other, and since competitors of Arden who were competing with it in the Los Angeles area were not competing with Arden in other areas where Arden was charging higher prices "there was no casual connection between the different prices of ice cream sold by Arden in Arizona, Washington, and Oregon, and any damage sustained by plaintiffs as a result of the lowering of prices in the Los Angeles area. The court ruled that there was absolutely no evidence in the record that the differentials as to sales in commerce or in other areas had any relation to any injury or damage which plaintiffs may have sustained. It is true that Arden in certain respects engages in interstate commerce, but the court ruled it does not follow that the price differential in different areas have any relation to each other, even if the sales involving interstate commerce were given consideration. The court again referred to the fact that in the Ballan case competing customers were not shown to have been charged different prices by Arden, and that feature indicated a variance from the case of the *Federal Trade Commission v. Morton Salt Co.* (334 U. S. 37). The court also stated that "Arden did not embark upon a campaign of selling goods shipped in interstate commerce at a loss in a local area to punish or designedly try to cause loss to one weaker competitor; and that it had no design to eliminate such a competitor and put him out of business by giving guaranties against loss to its own sales customers." Therefore, the court on that basis distinguished the Ballan case from the *Porto Rican American Tobacco Co. v. American Tobacco Co.* (30 Fed. 2d 234). What the court did not seem to understand is that under even the original Clayton Act of 1914 it was not required that one, damaged as a result of discriminations practiced by its competitors, be shown to have been in competition with the discriminator in more than one area where the discriminator made sales at different prices. Moreover, in a primary line injury case, such as the Ballan case, it has been irrelevant and immaterial since 1914 whether or not customers of the discriminating seller were in competition with each other. However, in the Ballan case the circuit court of appeals seems to regard such a fact as of prime importance. Without such a showing the court appeared to think that there would be no discrimination. It observed that "the statute requires that there be some discrimination." It appears that the court considered that without a showing to that effect it would have been necessary to show that Arden embarked "upon a campaign by selling goods shipped in interstate commerce at a loss in a local area to punish or designedly try to cause loss to one weaker competitor." Obviously if that test were to be satisfied, the Sherman Act would be found sufficient to deal with the problem.

Admittedly, in the Ballan case the state of competition had not been reduced to a contest between Arden and one weaker competitor. At the time the case was brought it had 15 competitors. Under the Clayton Act are we to permit the Arden Co. to continue its discriminatory practices, and therefore its march to a near monopoly position, until it is faced with only one weaker competitor? I submit that such idea was not in the minds

of those of us who drafted the Clayton Act and the Robinson-Patman amendment thereto. We thought of providing for a means to get at the monopolistic price discrimination in its incipency and before it had come to full flower. At the time the original Clayton Act was enacted we knew that the Sherman Act could be invoked to break up a monopoly which had been realized through the use of monopolistic practices. We desired to stop the practice before monopoly was created.

In conclusion, allow me to summarize some of the factual situation in which the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals appeared to find the existence of good faith. Arden, a large interstate operator, discriminated in price. It did so to meet and beat low competitive prices, described by the court as "chiseling cuts," which were being used by Arden's small local competitors in the Los Angeles area. In doing that, it injured those competitors. How many will disappear as a result of such injuries is anybody's guess. However, whether they disappear or whether they are taught lessons as a result of price discriminations on the part of Arden to never again cut their prices and thereby be charged with chiseling, it is a safe guess that the public will pay the bill in the form of higher ice cream prices in the Los Angeles area. Perhaps it is a simple case of nearsightedness on the part of the court when it viewed the lower discriminatory prices on the part of Arden as a boon "in the public interest."

We who support H. R. 11 and urge its enactment desire a return to first principles. We cannot understand the economic beliefs of those who advocate the use of such a monopolistic practice as price discrimination by the large corporate giant, Standard Oil Company of Indiana, as a good faith competitive act against small competitors. According to our understanding of economics, the result of what they advocate will be the opposite to competition. We do not want that result. We do not want substantial lessening of competition or the creation of monopoly. Therefore, we urge enactment of H. R. 11.

THE UNKNOWN MANAGERS OF OUR MONETARY SYSTEM WHO DETERMINE ECONOMIC POLICY CONTRARY TO WISHES OF WOODROW WILSON HAVE GOTTEN INTO PRIVATE BANKERS' HANDS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, we now have the type of situation that could have been predicted back in February 1951 when the bankers won their fight to make the Federal Reserve their own private instrument. The President has said that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers both have disputed the Federal Reserve decision to raise interest rates and tighten credit at this time. They felt that the Federal Reserve should have waited to see whether the inflationary threat was as real as they imagined it to be. But what did the Federal Reserve do? The current issue of *Business Week*—April 28, 1956—quotes a Treasury official:

The Fed has taken the bit in its teeth and is dragging the rest of us along.

This is the logical outcome of the fight over the independence of the Federal Reserve System. The Chairman of the Board of Governors and the 12 Reserve bank presidents elected by the commercial bankers of the country have the power to override economic policy de-

cisions of the people's elected representatives.

The absolutely amazing thing about this situation is that the President of the United States assents to the diminution of his powers to formulate and carry out economic policies. For the President said at his press conference that in the dispute he supported the Federal Reserve against his own Cabinet official and his own Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. He is mistaken when he says he believes that what is involved is the principle that the Board should be free from politics, and that he respects the independence of the Board. The Federal Reserve is a Government institution. It is a Government central bank. It is owned by the people of the United States. It is not the vehicle of the private bankers and was never intended to be such a vehicle. Its function is derived from the delegation of Congress' power to regulate the supply of money and credit and the value of the currency. It has been abusing that power since February 1951. We see millions of victims of that abuse of power when we witness the impoverished condition of agriculture and of the rising tide of small-business bankruptcies and forced mergers.

SMALL FIRMS HIT

The President said at his press conference that he had confidence in the Federal Reserve and promised that the Board would ease up if money conditions got too tight. It is obvious that the President was not fully informed as to how tight credit conditions have been for nearly a year. For example, I have a report issued by the Standard Factors Corp., of New York. It is based on a nationwide survey. Since April 1955 they have queried 727 manufacturers and 127 banks, in every major city and reserve district in the country. This is what they found. Most small-business firms in the sample had lost their bank credit lines during the past 12 months because of tightening bank credit. Big firms—\$500,000 net worth and over—were virtually unaffected. Loss of bank lines either puts the small man at a terrific disadvantage or else he has to close down completely. The rising tide of mergers and bankruptcies tell what the result of the five rediscount rate increases have meant to small business. I know that the Members will want to know about the plight of small business under the independent policy of the Federal Reserve which has been only recently reaffirmed by President Eisenhower. I am therefore including the results of the Standard Factors Corp. study in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

For: Standard Factors Corp., 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

From: Imberman & Deforest, 25 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Small- and medium-sized manufacturers have been hurt by credit restrictions during the past 12 months, although most larger corporations have been unaffected, says a study by Standard Factors Corp., entitled "One Year's Experience With Credit Controls." The study covering 727 manufacturers in 33 major industries and 127 banks in all parts of the country, was released today by Theodore H. Silbert, president of Standard Factors.

According to the report, "the tightening of the money supply has not affected all businesses in the same fashion. * * * While it is obviously not the desire of the Federal Reserve managers to discriminate among business borrowers, the net effect has been that as bank credit tightened, the largest borrowers have supplemented their bank credit by selling commercial paper, or borrowing from insurance companies or the public. The smaller and medium-sized manufacturers, on the other hand, have had to contend with a more desperate loan situation."

The report indicated that most companies with \$5,000 to \$25,000 net worth have lost their bank lines during the past 12 months because of tightening bank credit. Of companies with \$25,000 to \$100,000 net worth, about half lost bank lines. Of companies with \$100,000 to \$500,000 net worth, only about 12 percent lost bank lines. Companies with net worth over \$500,000 were said to be virtually unaffected by the tightening bank credit situation.

While many of these companies went to commercial finance companies for credit accommodations, the finance companies were also caught by the tightening bank credit situation. "Commercial finance companies operate on the basis of their own capital plus bank lines of credit," the report said. "With bank lines tighter, the finance companies could not begin to accommodate the demand. * * * Only those larger commercial finance companies with access to public financing, insurance companies loans and commercial paper market, were able to make some semblance of meeting the need."

As far as the banks are concerned, the report indicates that banks are most anxious to continue servicing their small-business customers, but "when restraining pressure on loans is applied from the top, the pressure usually is more severe in the case of the smaller- and medium-sized business, than when the corporation is larger."

In conclusion, the Standard Factors' report says: "Whether the country can afford to maintain uniform credit controls which affect the different segments of industry so differently, and which bankers themselves do not like, is something which the Federal Reserve System might reconsider."

ONE YEAR'S EXPERIENCE WITH CREDIT CONTROLS

For: Standard Factors Corp., 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

From: Imberman & DeForest, 25 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago 4, Ill.

APRIL 24, 1956.

The latest move of the Federal Reserve system in raising the rediscount rate to 2½ percent (and 3 percent for Minneapolis and San Francisco) is the fifth such increase since April 1955. Its avowed object is to hold back the inflationary pressures in our economy. With steel, nonferrous metal, rubber, and other basic producers working at 100 percent capacity, any further rise in industrial activity would scarcely produce any more goods but merely increase prices—with the inevitable consequences in new wage demands, higher costs, etc. Hence the rise in the rediscount rate which will tighten money still more and slow up the industrial parade—somewhat.

However, since this is the fifth increase within a year, we have been able to gage how credit restraint affects the different segments of business. Since April 1955 when the first rediscount raise was set into motion, until April 1956 when the fifth raise was announced, Standard Factors Corp. has queried 727 manufacturers and 127 banks. These manufacturers are located in every major city in the country; the banks are equally well distributed through the 12 Federal Reserve bank districts.

Despite the apparent fairness of the Federal Reserve banks' method of holding down credit expansion, we have found that the tightening of the money supply has not affected all businesses in the same fashion. Smaller business has felt the tightness worst; medium-sized corporations have been next in complaining about the money situation; large business has had little to worry about. While it is obviously not the desire of the Federal Reserve managers to discriminate among industrial and commercial borrowers, the net effect has been that as bank credit tightened, the largest borrowers have been able to supplement their bank credit by selling commercial paper, borrowing long-term funds from insurance companies or from the public. The smaller- and medium-sized manufacturers, on the other hand, have had to contend with a more desperate loan situation. This situation is clearly evident from the reports to this Standard Factors' survey.

WORST IN CERTAIN INDUSTRIES

This situation, according to our reports from 727 manufacturers, is found to be worst in the following manufacturing industries: machinery (nonelectrical); food and beverages; petroleum refining and chemicals; fabricated metals; transportation equipment; textiles and apparel; electrical machinery; stone, clay and glass products. Many other manufacturers report the same state of affairs, but the above-named industries show probably the worst effect of the uniform tightening of bank credit. In those industries, the smaller manufacturer has been virtually squeezed out of bank credit, while the medium-sized producer has had his line curtailed. Details on these companies are cited below.

On the banks' side, the reports from 127 banks show the utmost good will, and a keen desire to satisfy all their customers to the banks' best abilities. However, while banks are anxious to help all customers, there is a tendency for most of the pressure to work its way down to the smaller customer. For this there is evidently an economic reason: It takes almost as much personnel time and expense to administer a \$10,000 line of credit as it does to administer a \$100,000 line. Similarly, it takes no more time and personnel effort to administer a \$1 million line of credit than it does to watch over a \$100,000 line.

True, bank rates on small loans are higher than on larger loans. This must be so, because the bank cost of administration (and risk) is higher with the smaller credits. The cost of keeping track of smaller loans and investments in smaller business is high, and even going interest rates on smaller loans do not always cover the expense to the bank. But since lendable funds and bank personnel are at a premium—and since the risk on one \$1 million account is less than the risk on one hundred \$10,000 accounts—banks tend to hold on to their biggest and more stable customers.

COMMERCIAL FINANCE

The commercial finance industry has endeavored to take up the slack through accounts receivable financing, but even their resources are insufficient to help all the small- and medium-sized companies which are worthy of credit. Moreover, since commercial finance companies are themselves in good part dependent on bank lines for their resources, they cannot expand their lending in the face of tightening bank credit.

According to the reports from the 727 manufacturers to this Standard Factors survey, we find that prior to the first Federal Reserve Board hike in rediscount rate (April 1955) 89 percent of the companies were regular borrowers from commercial banks. Today, only 53 percent have bank lines. In

terms of net worth, here is a breakdown of the experience:

Net worth of companies	Percent of companies with bank lines March—	
	1955	1956
\$5,000 to \$25,000.....	53	18
\$25,000 to \$100,000.....	82	44
\$100,000 to \$500,000.....	94	79
\$500,000 to \$1,000,000.....	99	98
\$1,000,000 to \$2,500,000.....	99	98
Over \$2,500,000.....	99	99

It is interesting to notice that the smaller companies (under \$25,000 net worth) had felt the most severe effects of the tightening bank credit. Slightly more than half of these companies had bank lines in March 1955. These lines were used to discount bills, carry inventories for processing or for sale, or to take care of payrolls or current operating bills until payment had been received from sales. While only 53 percent of these smaller companies had bank lines when the credit squeeze began, only 18 percent of these companies were left with bank lines a year later. Loss of bank lines often puts the smaller-business man at a fatal disadvantage.

NEXT IN LINE

Looking at the small-medium companies (\$25,000 to \$100,000) net worth, the drop here was from 82 percent with bank lines, to 44 percent a year later. Almost half the companies in this category lost their bank lines. This, of course, is not as large a drop as in the smallest class, but severe enough.

When we come to the medium-sized company (\$100,000 to \$500,000 net worth), the drop is much smaller—from 94 to 79 percent. Above the \$500,000 net worth class, there is virtually no change in bank credit. The minute shift in the larger companies was due to public financing, or long-term loans from insurance companies to replace bank borrowings.

What did the companies do to replace bank accommodations? Many of them went to commercial finance companies and accounts receivable financing. But here too they met the other side of the tightening bank credit situation. Since commercial finance companies operate on the basis of their own capital plus bank lines of credit—and since tightening bank credit affects commercial finance companies also—the finance companies could not begin to accommodate the demand. Their own resources were squeezed by tighter bank credit—and only those larger commercial finance companies which have access to public financing, to direct placement loans from insurance companies, and to the commercial paper market, were able to make some semblance of meeting the demand.

BANKS LIKE SMALL BUSINESS

As far as the 127 banks are concerned, their confidential replies to this survey indicate that far from shying away from small business, the average bank is, in itself, small business and is largely occupied with small-business loans. Nationally, most banks are small business, but many of these banks participate in larger loans through larger banks in the major commercial centers.

However, with the loan demand rising all over the country, many of the smaller banks have been withdrawing their deposits with larger banks, and using these funds for their own loans. In addition, all banks have met the expanding demand for loans by reducing their investment portfolios. This they have done by selling their Government securities. This sale has been proceeding (in 1956) at an average rate of about \$200 million a week. Sale of investments on such a scale is indicative of a strong pressure of loan demands,

for the sales involve losses which banks are naturally reluctant to take. Yet they do take them, in order to be able to accommodate customers.

But when it comes to determining what customers should be satisfied first, bankers (apparently like everyone else) must look to the customer which gives them volume, to the customer most apt to be around the bank in the years to come, and the customer which involves (for the bank) the least risk of the depositors' money. Volume, continuity of business, and least risk, characterize the larger corporations.

While the reports from banks show that bankers lean over backwards to continue serving their smaller commercial customers, nevertheless the reports also indicate that when the question of renewal of 30-, 60-, and 90-day commercial loans or notes arises, the decision is apt to be far more severe and critical in the case of the smaller- and medium-sized business, than when the corporation is larger.

Whether the country can afford to maintain uniform credit controls which effect the different segments of industry so differently, and which bankers themselves do not like, is something which the Federal Reserve System might reconsider.

The manufacturing industries covered in this study of 727 companies are: Agricultural implements; automobile parts; bedsprings and mattresses; breweries; chemicals; men's and women's clothing; confectionery; cloth mills; drugs; electrical machinery; electrical parts; electronics; foundries; fruit and vegetable canners; furniture; hardware and tools; hosiery; lumber; industrial machinery; meat packers; metal stampings; paints and varnishes; paper; paper boxes; petroleum; plastics; radio and television; shoes; soft drinks; steel and metal fabricators; stone, clay, and glass products; and transportation equipment.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION RETARDED

Small-business men have, of course, not been the sole victims of this interest-boasting crusade. Schoolchildren are being made to pay for the bankers' policies, too. I have a copy of the New York Times, Monday, April 30, 1956, before me. The headline says: "United States Credit Policy Held School Curb." Then it goes on:

New York State Controller Arthur Levitt declared yesterday that Federal monetary policies were seriously threatening the State's public construction program. It is virtually impossible, he said, for school districts to borrow money at interest rates they can afford.

What sense does it make for the President to hold a White House Conference on Education to confirm that there is a tremendous need for schools and then call on Congress to enact a construction program, when he endorses a policy which does not permit school construction at present levels to proceed? To be charitable I must conclude that the President is not well informed about the state of money and credit in the country. Else how could he have said, as he is reported to have, that he was confident the Board would ease up before money dries up? How dry must the well get before it is dried up?

I am inserting for the benefit of my colleagues, particularly my Republican colleagues, the full article disclosing the harmful effect of hard-money policies on our schoolchildren. I hope one of them will be thoughtful enough to call it to the attention of the White House.

[From the New York Times of April 30, 1956]

UNITED STATES CREDIT POLICY HELD SCHOOL CURB—LEVITT CONTENDS THAT RISE IN INTEREST RATE HINDERS BUILDING IN STATE

State Controller Arthur Levitt declared yesterday that Federal monetary policies were seriously threatening the State's school construction program. It is virtually impossible, he said, for school districts to borrow money at interest rates that they can afford.

The State's chief fiscal officer called for a revision of Federal policies that would maintain guards against inflation but permit public construction to proceed.

Mr. Levitt attributed the tight credit situation partly to the recent decision of the Federal Reserve Board to increase the discount rate from 2½ percent to 3½ percent. The discount rate is the interest that banks must pay to borrow from the Federal Reserve System. The increase was designed to curb inflationary trends by making borrowing less attractive.

"The impact of that policy on the State level," Mr. Levitt said, "has been to make it virtually impossible for school districts to borrow money to finance school construction."

He called it an alarming spectacle that the city of Philadelphia failed to get a single bid last week on a bond offer of \$4,900,000 at 3 percent.

SCHOOL-DEBT BURDEN

Mr. Levitt reported that he recently had purchased \$2 million of Long Island school district bonds with a 3½-percent interest rate for the State retirement system. "School districts," he said, "simply cannot sustain that kind of debt burden."

The State controller, a Democrat, appeared with Attorney General Jacob K. Javits, a Republican, on the televised program, "Viewpoint," over WRCA-TV.

Mr. Javits declared that there should be less borrowing by governments and that the borrowing opportunities for individuals should be increased.

The attorney general said he had no fears about installment selling and that increased consumer buying would stimulate production and other factors producing tax funds. That, he argued, would enable governments to undertake more construction on a pay-as-you-go basis.

The State has an interest in the tighter credit situation because of the prospective sale of bonds for mental hospitals, thruway, and grade-crossing construction. In addition, two bond issues, one of \$500 million for highways and a second of \$100 million for middle-income housing, are to go to the voters in November.

Mr. Levitt, while conceding the anti-inflation purposes of Federal monetary policies, asserted that "nobody in responsible positions contended that public construction should be slowed down."

In view of prospective State spending, Mr. Javits criticized both Governor Harriman and the Republican-controlled legislature for their part in effecting an income tax reduction. Mr. Levitt defended the tax cut on the basis of the State's cash surplus.

The State controller saw no inconsistency on the part of the Governor in advocating at the same time an income tax cut and an increase in the motor fuel taxes to financing the highway construction program.

"The modern tendency in regard to highway construction," Mr. Levitt said, "is to finance it by a users' tax and not by an income tax."

Mr. Javits contended that the legislature, in refusing to go along with an increase in the gasoline tax after voting an income tax reduction, "was a lot more honest with itself than the Governor."

SUPPORTING A CONDEMNED POLICY

We are in the ridiculous position of having the Government and its leading Cabinet official carrying out a policy which they publicly condemn, because they are willing to let the Fed take the bit in its teeth and drag the rest of the country along. I refer to the fact that the Treasury is in the market actually supporting the price of its own issues. Is it not ridiculous? The Secretary of Treasury is opposed to the Fed supporting his securities, but he is willing for the Fed to force him to do so. How ludicrous can they get? If this was not such a deadly serious business it would be a joke.

The fact is, according to Business Week—April 23, 1956—that the only thing which has stopped the price of Governments from going through the floor has been the substantial purchasing of bonds by the Treasury. Of course the Treasury recognizes how ludicrous their position would be if they acknowledged they were supporting bond prices so they rationalize by stating: "We decided to take advantage of the high interest rates you can get on Treasury bonds."

Sure the trust funds get the benefit, but what about the cost of servicing the debt? Is not the Treasury concerned about higher interest rates raising the cost of the public debt? Of course they are. That is why the Secretary is investing trust-fund money in buying his own securities.

This goes to show that Secretary Snyder's position was right. The Treasury has to be concerned about the cost of the debt and about its ability to sell Government securities to the public. That is a major reason why we cannot let the Fed take the bit in its teeth and drag the rest of us along.

FEUD OVER CREDIT POLICY

I am including a copy of the Business Week article, A New Feud Over Credit Policy, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A NEW FEUD OVER CREDIT POLICY

The Federal Reserve's decision to step a little harder on the credit brakes (Business Week, April 21, 1956, p. 23) has renewed an ancient policy split between William McC. Martin's Federal Reserve Board and Secretary George M. Humphrey's Treasury Department.

As Martin sees it, the danger of inflation dictates a definite squeeze on credit. Humphrey feels the Fed could well have waited a little longer before tightening up.

Last week Fed followed up its action of raising the discount rate by selling over \$70 million in 91-day Treasury bills. This reduced the amount of credit available to the banking system.

But at the same time, the Treasury took a step directly in the opposite direction—to ease credit. And the Federal Home Loan Bank Board did the same, further indicating dissatisfaction with the Fed's policy.

BOND PURCHASE

The Treasury Department was reported to have bought its own securities in the open market for the account of Government trust funds such as the Government Life Insurance Fund and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The Treasury did not announce the amount of bonds it purchased, but bond dealers termed the buying substantial. This served to increase the amount of credit in the banking system, and, according to one dealer, "it was the only thing that stopped the continued decline in bond prices."

RAISING THE CEILING

On top of that, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board revealed that it had put through a new relaxation in the borrowing privileges accorded member saving and loan associations. Under the new provision, all associations will be able to borrow up to 10 percent of their saving deposits from the FHLB. Previously, the ceiling on member borrowing was 5 percent.

Walter W. McAllister, chairman of the FHLB, denied that this lifting of the ceiling on borrowing was in conflict with overall credit policy. But he added that in his view, "there is now little danger of rampant inflation."

FED'S FEARS

This view is not shared by the Federal Reserve Board, which has tightened up precisely because it fears an outbreak of inflation. The Fed considered the relaxation on borrowing as directly contrary to its own policy.

The Treasury's action is not such a clear-cut example of finding fault with the Fed. But according to one Treasury official, there was a real dispute over the Fed's action. Treasury Secretary Humphrey and Arthur Burns, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, were both reluctant to see a tightening at this time. They felt that the Fed should have waited until the economic outlook was clearer.

This is not the first time that there has been a dispute between the Fed, the Treasury, and the CEA. However, the Fed has usually lagged behind the others in deciding on policy. Now, as a Treasury official put it, "the Fed has taken the bit in its teeth and is dragging the rest of us along."

TREASURY'S EXPLANATION

Actually the Treasury denies that its buying is anything out of the ordinary. One official said: "We decided to take advantage of the high interest rates that you can get on Treasury bonds."

But there is no doubt that while the purchase of bonds benefited its trust funds, it was also a means of countering the Fed's move. And the Treasury still has a big reserve of funds that could be used to prop up bond prices and help ease the drain on credit.

The Treasury has used this purchasing power to counter Fed policy in the past. In March 1951, for example, when the Fed was asserting its independence from Treasury influence, the trust funds made net purchases in the open market of almost \$500 million in Government bonds.

Money market experts believe that buying on this scale would crimp the Fed's effectiveness, at least in the short run. But they expect that before there is a definite breach between the Fed and Treasury, both sides will attempt to reach a compromise.

REAPPRAISAL SEEN

Some observers think that the Fed has already decided against carrying its policy much further. They believe that, instead of insisting on a uniform discount rate of 3 percent for the 12 regional Fed banks, the Board of Governors will refrain from tampering with the present differential between the San Francisco and Minneapolis banks, where the rate already is 3 percent, and the 10 other banks, where it is 2½ percent. Instead, the Fed is expected to hold off further moves until it sees whether its policy to date has been effective.

At this point, I wish to correct an inadvertent omission of material which I intended to insert in the body of my remarks last Friday. I referred to information concerning rates of return on Government bonds which appeared in the Aubrey Lanston, Inc., weekly letter.

The information which I intended to include is as follows:

The Treasury security market reacted only moderately on Friday. The larger price declines took place in the shorter-term issues. At the prices on some of the issues, yields have become rather handsome. You'd have to go back to the days of the "bank holiday" in the early 1930's to find higher ones.

The 1½s of May 15, 1957 (13 months to maturity) offer a gross return (before taxes) of 2.99 percent. If a taxpayer subject to a 52 percent rate can take a long-term gain at maturity the rate of return is equal to about 3.77 percent on a fully taxable basis. The 2½s of June 15, 1958 (2½ years to maturity) offer a gross return of 3.26 percent and an alternative long-term gains equivalent to 3.50 percent. The 2½s of June 15, 1958 (also 2½ years to maturity) offer a gross return of 3.21 percent and an alternative taxable equivalent yield of 3.69 percent. The 2½s of June 15, 1962/59 offer a gross yield of 3.20 percent and taxable equivalent of 3.79 percent—to maturity. To the call date (June 1959) the respective yields are 4.04 percent and 5.10 percent. Who can be sure they won't be called? And, what a bonanza yield from United States Treasuries whether they are or not.

I want to close my review of recent developments in credit policy by calling attention to what I regard as the most significant development in this area in recent history. It is the announcement that for the first time in its history the New York Federal Reserve Bank had gone outside and selected a private commercial banker to be its president since the Open Market Committee was established. This selection was made by a board of directors of nine men. Six of them represented the commercial bankers of the New York Reserve district.

The New York Federal Reserve Bank under the governorship of Benjamin Strong, the last commercial banker to head that institution, ruled the money system of this country. That was before the tremendous power over open-market operations was given to one holding that position. The results were not too satisfactory. This decision to appoint a commercial banker to head up the New York Federal Reserve Bank makes it more important than ever that the Congress consider the desirability of removing the seat of the Open Market Committee's operations from the New York bank and establishing it here in Washington under the control of the Board of Governors.

I am including an editorial from the New York Times, May 2, commenting on Mr. Sproul's resignation and the appointment of Mr. Alfred Hayes to succeed him:

MR. SPROUL STEPS DOWN

The decision of Allan Sproul, president of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, to resign that important post will be received with mixed emotions by his colleagues in the system and by everyone who realized the vital role he has played in the system's affairs in recent years. If they think of it in terms of the banking system, they cannot help being dismayed, but this dismay will be softened by the consideration that in the 36 years he has given to the Reserve System he has contributed immensely to its prestige, and if this is what he wants, then so be it, and all possible good luck to him.

We can be certain, however, of one thing. It would occur to no one to question Mr. Sproul's simple explanation of his retirement, when he says he wants to return to

California while he is young enough to enjoy retirement, this clearly is the reason he is retiring.

There is another thing that no one who knows Mr. Sproul will have to be told. They won't have to be told that he would not be stepping out of the picture if it were 5 years ago, and if the Federal Reserve System were engaged in a struggle for survival such as that in which it found itself in the early postwar years with the Treasury. With the possible exception of Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of the Board of Governors, no one in the System contributed more to the Reserve's fight for freedom that culminated in the accord of 1951 than did the head of the New York bank. Perhaps the best and most authoritative estimate of Allan Sproul is that to be found in Mr. Eccles' autobiographical volume, *Beckoning Frontiers*, which appeared in 1951. Writes Mr. Eccles:

"It should be said of Sproul that we sometimes disagreed over policy matters, but our differences were never marked by personal acrimony. Despite the fact that he had been elected to his post at the head of the New York Reserve Bank by the action of its board of directors, six of whom were elected by the banks of the district, Sproul was and is first and foremost a representative of the public interest. He has sometimes argued the case of the banks, but he has just as often argued against them. He has been and is a tower of strength in the Reserve System."

The board of directors of the bank, in selecting as Mr. Sproul's successor Alfred Hayes, vice president of the New York Trust Co., has provided a news story almost as surprising as that of Mr. Sproul's own resignation. In naming Mr. Hayes, a gifted student who attracted much attention by a thesis on Reserve policy prepared while he was studying at Oxford, they have gone outside the System for a chief executive for the first time since the late Benjamin Strong came out of the Bankers Trust Co. to take over the No. 1 post (then the post of governor) 40 years ago.

SENATOR BARKLEY

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, to me, as to the American people, news of ALBEN BARKLEY's passing came as a great shock and brought a sense of deep, poignant grief. Only last Wednesday night, I attended a Congressional Night dinner and program at the National Press Club where this great man was an honored guest.

I had the opportunity again to meet and talk with him. He appeared to be his usual self. He was, as customary with him, genial, cordial and good-humored. He addressed the gathering in the role of station announcer on the mock radio program being conducted by the famous television personality, Hal March, entitled "The Sixty-Four Billion Dollar Question."

As usual the great, noble son of Kentucky stole the show. With devastating shafts of humor and satire, he lampooned his political opponents while carrying out his assignment as station announcer. He seemed to be in good physical condition, was vigorous of manner and spirit and he completely captivated the audience. It was the last time I was to see and hear ALBEN BARKLEY. A

few days later I learned the sorrowful news of his most lamentable demise.

I had personally known ALBEN BARKLEY for many years. I had met him through my great, beloved friend, the late, distinguished Senator David I. Walsh, of Massachusetts, of revered and lamented memory. I had supported Senator BARKLEY at various Democratic Conventions for President and Vice President of the United States.

ALBEN BARKLEY was one of the outstanding statesmen of American history. I cannot here do justice to his life, his fine qualities, his superb abilities, his splendid achievements. That task is for others. But I desire to express my personal grief and extend my sympathy to his gracious help-mate and bereaved family.

He was a man of tremendous stature endowed by the Almighty with widely diverse talents and gifts. Of lovable personal traits, ready wit, good fellowship, interested in people, he had a remarkable sense of humor. He was a most engaging raconteur on and off the platform.

And he had a very deep religious and spiritual side to his nature which was manifest in his attitude throughout his life and was emphasized in an immemorable manner in the last words he spoke:

I would rather be a servant in the house of the Lord than sit in the seat of the mighty.

ALBEN BARKLEY made many eloquent speeches that will go down in history. But none will be so famous, so well-known, so much a part of future American life as that moving last sentence of his final speech.

He was a man of strength, of power, of great gifts, and high position. He achieved great lasting distinction in political history and statescraft. But he kept his humble faith in the Lord to the very last breath of his honored being.

ALBEN BARKLEY will be long remembered with fond appreciation and utmost respect. For he was a sterling statesman in the best sense of the word, a truly great human being, an illustrious American.

Lawyer, jurist, Congressman, United States Senator, Vice President of the United States, he sat in truth in the seats of the mighty, but he always kept his faith in God, in his country, and his fellow man. And that will be his glorious, enduring epitaph.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I was called to the telephone on an emergency matter during the last rollcall. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

REQUEST FOR AN APPROPRIATION OF \$4 MILLION FOR TAMPA HARBOR PROJECT

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, during the hearings of the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Appropriations Committee of the House the Florida delegation unanimously supported my appeal for \$2.5 million to be appropriated to continue work on Tampa Harbor which was recommended by the President in his budget message.

This week, again with the unanimous support of the delegation I appeared before the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Senate Appropriations Committee and testified in regard to the same Tampa Harbor construction. However, at this time and because of a recent survey completed by the United States Army Engineers only on April 21, 1956 after the House committee hearings were completed and immediately before the Senate hearings, the request for funds was increased to \$4 million before the Senate subcommittee. The Engineers testified in favor of this increase before the same subcommittee based on this new survey.

I wish to discuss these reasons before the House, reasons which I believe fully justify the favorable action by the Senate and concurrence therein in conference by the House conferees.

This is in the nature of an emergency request based upon newly discovered and developed information resulting from recent experience showing that presently recommended funds would run out due to accelerated work before the end of fiscal 1957.

The following facts, which were called to the attention of the Senate subcommittee, I now call to the attention of the House:

One of the harbor projects begun in 1955 was in the First District of Florida and serves a great portion of the entire State. That project is Tampa Harbor for which last year \$977,000 was appropriated to begin a program of work in deepening and widening the channel to accommodate traffic that is using this harbor and of which there is even greater potential. It is my purpose here today to ask that you continue this great work and that an appropriation of \$4 million be passed by Congress. This request is \$1.5 million more than recommended in the 1957 Budget by the President and earlier requested before the House committee. The need for these additional funds and savings to the Government that can be effected by this enlarged appropriation now, in a project expected to total some \$11 million, has only recently become known and I wish to take this opportunity to explain the urgency of additional funds.

In the preliminary planning of this project first consideration was given to the dredging of the channel and increase of depth from 27-30 feet and widening to 400 feet from the present 300-foot width the distance of some 50 miles. The United States Army Engineers let contracts for the dredging in 1955 and work has been under way in a contracted amount of \$3,100,000. Progress on this portion of the dredging has proceeded at a greater pace than anticipated by the Engineers. In a report just made on April 21, 1956, and subsequent to both the preparation of the budget and hear-

ings before the committee of the House, it is now revealed that this contract will be completed early in 1957 at the present rate of progress. The original appropriation of \$977,000 and the earlier budget-requested funds of \$2,500,000 will not be sufficient to carry on this rate of work and the entire project would have to be called to a halt in early 1957 unless additional funds are provided at this time. The truth of the matter is that the work is well ahead of the money. For this reason and through the engineering data made available in the testimony of the United States Army Engineers earlier in hearings before the Senate subcommittee, I believe we are fully justified in asking these additional funds.

I have indicated savings could be made by such action and this will be evident to you when it is realized that should present funds be depleted early in 1957 and no work continued until money is available in fiscal 1958 the cost of reactivation of the dredges themselves would be heavily reflected in the bids received which bids are expected to run an additional \$600,000. Such substantial savings should not be overlooked in the efficient progress of this project.

Because of the rapid development of the work on these channels that segment known as Egmont and Mullet Key Channels where work will be done by the United States Army Engineers hopper dredge, should also be gotten under way in 1957. Anticipating 5 months work in each of the fiscal years 1957 and 1958 an additional \$625,000 will be needed in fiscal 1957.

Activation of both of these dredging portions of the project at the same time and to thus complete in the year 1958 the Hillsboro Channel portion of the project will see even more benefit savings. Figures now available clearly show that use of the Hillsboro-Tampa channel portion of the project as herein proposed at the projected tonnage rate to be shown later indicate that \$1,500,000 per year will be saved at that time. Therefore the additional amount requested above the earlier request will be fully justified by this additional saving. Estimates of the benefit-cost ratio have now been placed at 3.38 to 1 on this segment of the channel and I feel sure that this is a conservative figure.

There follows a summarization of the figures used above:

Schedule A	
Fiscal 1956 appropriation for Tampa Harbor project.....	\$977,000
Actual expenditures:	
Hopper dredging.....	280,000
Hydraulic dredging.....	785,000
Engineering.....	130,000
Supervision and engineering.....	87,000
Total expenditure.....	1,282,000
Advanced by U. S. Army engineers (to permit contract performance).....	305,000
Total.....	1,282,000
Funds required, fiscal 1957:	
Repayment of advance by U. S. Army engineers to project.....	305,000
U. S. Army engineers (supervision and administration)....	174,000

Schedule A—Continued

Funds required, fiscal 1957—Con.	
Payment to Standard Dredging Corp. to complete work on \$3.1 million contract covering dredging on cuts A-F Tampa Bay channels (\$785,000 of contract will be completed in 1955-56)—ful contract to be completed early 1957	
	\$2,315,000
Subtotal	2,794,000
Request 1957 budget	2,500,000
Additional required	294,000
Pro rata portion of second contract and required in early 1957 to permit work on dredging to continue without extra cost of activation and deactivation which would raise this estimated bid—4 months' work to June 30, 1957	600,000
5 months work by U. S. Army engineers hopper dredge on Egmont and Mullet Key channels—includes supervision and administration cost	625,000
Total additional funds required over budget request of \$2.5 million for 1957	1,519,000
Total recommended as appropriation for 1957	4,000,000

NOTE.—These figures are as prepared by the U. S. Army engineers and are consistent with testimony by them before the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Senate Appropriations Committee. They include figures not available prior to April 21, 1956.

Mr. CRAMER. Many of the persons from the Tampa Bay area personally appeared before the committees last year and testified that the start of this project, in their opinion, would unquestionably accelerate harbor growth. It is astounding proof of this that, according to port authority estimates 2 months ago, \$5,500,000 in new and port facilities have been committed during calendar year 1955. This figure can now be placed in excess of \$10 million. Yet this is only the beginning of the tremendous industrial and commercial program which has been indicated by the commencement of this harbor project. Exemplary is announcement in the last 2 weeks of construction of a new industrial-molasses tank and dock, fully substantiating the judgment of this committee for this growth that unquestionably shows the local community is fulfilling its obligation in making full use of the new opportunities afforded it by the Tampa Harbor improvements.

In 1954, the port of Tampa had a total tonnage of 9,813,000 tons. In 1955 it is conservatively estimated that this has increased over 7 percent to over 10,500,000 tons. Exact figures have not yet been completed. This is far in excess of the Army engineers' estimates made in 1948. The estimated port tonnage in the calendar year of 1959 of 15 million tons based on this 7.6 percent annual increase is a conservative estimate. For example, it is known that within the next 3 years there will be additional port tonnage from new industries—which has not been taken into consideration in the normal

port growth—of 3,500,000 tons per year. This would consist of approximately 2,500,000 tons of petroleum and petroleum products which would result from new terminal facilities and the first oil refinery in the port of Tampa; coal of 750,000 tons from a new electric generating plant, using coal for fuel; and other products of 250,000 tons. This again is very conservative. New barge terminals have just been completed for the transport of steel, grain, and general cargo.

This would mean that, by the calendar year 1959 it could well be and probably will be, the port of Tampa will have annual tonnage of 18 million to 19 million tons, providing harbor improvements progress rapidly, continuing to encourage its growth. It is this year in which the economic return will truly manifest itself and justify orderly and early completion of the project.

The most recent figures available indicate that projected estimates have been conservative. Port tonnage for the first 2 months in 1956 were 22 percent above that of last year and increased 345,000 from 1,529,000 tons in 1955 to 1,853,000 tons in 1956. Final figures for 1955 have not been completed by the engineers but their present indications are that total tonnage for 1955 will exceed 10,500,000 tons and continue to be well in excess of the projected growth factor of 7.6 percent per annum as estimated by the engineers.

Even more amazing figures of the growth of this port are indicated in the receipts of customs duties. In the first quarter of 1956 receipts were \$1,091,000, some \$373,000 over the same period in 1955, or a gain of 52 percent in 1 year's time.

The increase and growth of industry in this area and its tremendously increasing population has greatly increased the use of petroleum and other products. In 1954 the petroleum usage of the port was 4,579,000 tons. Upon facts now known, the increase in petroleum in 1955 was in excess of the 10 percent estimated by the port authority, based upon 1954 figures. With the known new industrial facilities that are coming into being in this area, by 1959 it is entirely reasonable to assume that there would be over 8 million tons of petroleum and petroleum products passing through the port of Tampa.

The usage of this port by coastwise trade is progressing rapidly. In the 5-year period, 1949 to 1954, the average annual increase in tonnage was 9.1 percent. Projecting a growth of 5 percent a year over the 1954 tonnage of 5,477,000 shows that there would be coastwise trade in 1959 of over 7 million tons. This is an entirely reasonable projection of growth and, as a matter of fact, it is obviously conservative when the factors of new industries are taken into account.

Over 75 percent of phosphate produced in the world is produced within a radius of 80 miles of this port. In 1949, 5,477,000 tons of phosphate were exported through this port. I believe it of interest to your committee that this area served by the port of Tampa is increasing in its population at the rate of over 6 percent per year. This is one of the

most rapidly expanding areas in the United States. Moreover, this rapid expansion is reflected in the industrial growth of this area. Since the apparent start of this project in early 1955, over \$70 million in new deepwater industrial construction has been started or definitely committed.

In 1956 additional industrial construction utilizing Tampa Harbor is under way.

All this is indicative of the fact that the phenomenal growth of this area renders estimates of port growth and usage almost unpredictable. Yet, it is apparent that the estimated annual port tonnage in 1959 of 15 million tons is most conservative. Using this basis of annual tonnage of 15 million tons, the direct economic benefits and annual savings resulting from completion of this harbor project will be approximately \$2,230,000. Thus, in using the criteria used by the Corps of Engineers in their determination, the benefit-cost ratio as fixed by the Hillsboro County Port Authority is 5 to 1 and would give to this project an unusually high benefit-cost ratio. The Army engineers in 1954 fixed benefit-cost ratio at 2.25 to 1. This has now been raised to 2.6 to 1 by testimony this year before the committees.

I urge the Congress, based upon the figures presented here and by the United States Army Engineers, to provide this appropriation in the additional amount needed above that of the budget request in order that economy of operation will be served and that an orderly program of development of this vital project can be brought about. The work in this important harbor is of great importance. The present inadequate channels have placed the port in the status of a second-class harbor and the only sizable port between Norfolk and New Orleans with less than 34 feet channel depth. At the same time Tampa Harbor has more annual tonnage than any harbor from Norfolk to Mobile. I am sure the Appropriations Committees and Congress will act to best serve the over 1 million population served by this port of the west coast of Florida.

AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1956

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago a so-called farm bill was passed by this body and thereafter and in due course it arrived at the White House. Its provisions were so ill-advised and so obnoxious that it was promptly vetoed by the President.

Now and under date of April 30 there is available for the first time a bill entitled the "Agricultural Act of 1956." It is presented to us under an open rule and numerous amendments have been proposed which simply means that we are attempting to legislate here on the floor of the House on a few minutes notice for the agriculture of America. The bill

itself is 53 pages long with a comparatively brief report of 23 pages.

Not a farm organization in the country nor a single farmer knows how this farm legislation stands at the moment nor what the bill contains for him. I suspect that it contains nothing but grief for the farmers of my district and higher prices for my consumers to say nothing of the tremendous burden on our taxpayers.

This is hasty and politically inspired legislation at its worst and I intend to vote against it.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill H. R. 10875.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that it is necessary for me to be absent today on important official business, when the House has before it the agriculture bill of 1956. The measure was not previously programmed for this week, and in the meantime I made certain commitments I am obliged to fulfill.

I have not missed a single vote in this session of Congress on the many measures that have come before us affecting our farmers. Nor would I miss this one today were it not absolutely necessary and were it not that I have assurances from the leadership of the Republican Party that my presence is not necessary, as most of the differences on the various features of the proposed legislation have been resolved.

Having been brought up on the farm, naturally I am inclined to favor any sound proposition that would be for the benefit of deserving farmers. For a number of years I have been a member of the Grange and of the Farm Bureau, and I have been in close touch with the various programs that have been advanced for the benefit of the farmers. I have given considerable study and thought to the whole subject, and particularly to the bill now before the House.

The bill before the House is by no means perfect in every particular, but I do believe that on the whole it will make a constructive contribution for a solution to the farm problem. Were I present today and voting I would, accordingly, vote for the bill.

Agriculture is the leading industry of all of our industries. More people are employed in agriculture than any other business, and more money is invested in agriculture properties than any other business,

My votes in Congress have always been in favor of giving encouragement to this big industry and to the many people who engage in agricultural pursuits. My votes have always been for legislation which will give our worthy farmers a program that is economically sound and which will enable them to progress and prosper.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much impressed with the debate on the soil-bank bill that has been before us. Practically all of the argument that has been presented thus far accents the immediate economic value to the farmers of the soil-bank program. It is not my purpose to deny or to take issue with those who argue this point of view, but, Mr. Speaker, I think there is another viewpoint—a long-range viewpoint that should be called to the attention of the Members of the House. Therefore, I should like to address my remarks to the soil-bank program as it relates to the economics of America over a period of years—what it means not alone to the farmers but to all America and to posterity.

The conservation-reserve provision of the soil-bank program is a great step in the direction of a more efficient land-use program.

The need for soil conservation can scarcely be overemphasized. History is replete with examples of nations that have declined or perished because of land impoverishment through misuse, neglect, and erosion.

Accelerated erosion of the soil is not merely a recent threat to human security; it is as old as agriculture itself. Erosion most likely began when the first rain struck the first furrow turned by a crude implement in the hands of prehistoric man. There is little doubt that it has been going on ever since, wherever man's efforts to gain a livelihood from the soil have led him to remove the natural cover of protective vegetation. History, to a great extent, is a record of man's efforts to wrest the land from nature, simply because he relies for sustenance on the products of the soil. Yet in many instances his conquest of the land has been disastrous. Over extensive areas, his culture of the earth has resulted in extreme impoverishment or nearly complete destruction of the soil resources upon which he is dependent. When this has occurred on a wide scale, the consequence has been the disappearance of civilization from the affected region. To illustrate the effects of soil erosion during ancient times, I would like to quote a few lines from an article entitled "Erosion at Its Worst, and a Hundred Dead Cities," written during 1939 by Dr. Walter C. Lowdermilk, former Assistant Chief of the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture:

The dead cities of north Syria reveal a period of history of which very little is thus far known. It was a local civilization but very advanced and rich, with highly developed and distinctive Syrian art found nowhere else. . . . Today, after 13 centuries of neglect and patch cultivation to cereals by seminomadic descendants of the invaders, and of overgrazing by their goats, soil erosion has completed the destruction of the good earth with a thoroughness that has left this once fertile land a complete manmade

desert, void of vegetation, water, and soil, except in rare pockets with scanty cover of crops and thorn bushes. The ruins of a highly developed architecture tell of the advanced culture of this region.

As in north China, north Africa, Transjordan, and elsewhere, soil erosion is clearly the principal agent in destroying the land and in undermining the civilization and culture which was dependent upon it. The early inhabitants found primeval forests here. Then began moderate clearing, deforestation and cultivation of slopes. Ancient cultivation up through the Roman period was intelligent and demonstrated an understanding on the part of the inhabitants of conservation of soils and rain waters by terraces and check dams. At this time the region was highly prosperous, populous, and flourishing. But in A. D. 630 the Arab invasion swept away progress in agriculture. The vineyards and olive trees were destroyed, and the land was put under patch cultivation to grain crops and heavily grazed. After the destruction and dispersal of the former population, neglect of the land brought . . . on erosion of the soil. . . .

These hundred or more dead cities are dead forever because their soils are gone beyond any hope of reclamation. . . . Man and erosion have devastated this area for a geologic age. Here the unpardonable sin of land use has been committed.

Soil conservationists find in Syria many lessons which we in this country may well take to heart. It is true that we have for some time now attempted to preserve our forests and to rebuild our soil, but have we done enough? Have we used our acres in such a way as to yield the greatest returns to our farmers and to the Nation as a whole? When we examine areas where erosion has taken its toll, such as the Dust Bowl, I think the answer is quite clear. There is very little doubt about the fact that many acres now being used for cultivated crops should never have been plowed. Many of these acres should be restored to forests and grasslands.

The conservation reserve provision of the soil-bank proposal is a major forward step in the direction of achieving a better land-use program. If finally adopted, the conservation reserve plan will lead to a program yielding greater net returns to farmers today and at the same time leading to a land-use program that will make it possible to provide fertile farmlands for future generations.

The objective of this program as originally proposed was to shift about 25 million acres from cropland to forage, trees, or water storage. This shift as proposed was intended to lead to a long-range adjustment in land use. Some of our less productive lands would be brought into the program, as well as some of the acres which have been diverted out of wheat and cotton into feed grains and other crops.

The current legislation with respect to the soil bank, if enacted and approved during this session of the Congress, would provide a maximum of \$450 million annually to carry out the conservation reserve phase of the program.

The Government, through the agricultural conservation program currently in operation and the conservation reserve provision of the soil-bank program, makes manifest the obligation of the whole people to share the responsibility, as well as the benefits, of assuring the continued fertility of our soil. By help-

ing farmers, with money or conservation materials and technical services, to accomplish specified conservation practices, the program practically and directly helps make effective the research and educational work done by the Federal and State agencies. Funds appropriated to help conserve the soil and water resources of the Nation are a practical investment in the future welfare and productivity of the country. There is every reason to believe that soil conservation is our common concern whether we are farmers, manufacturers, food processors, bankers, merchants or professional people.

It is evident that continued and ever-increasing measures to conserve and rebuild the fertility of our land are necessary if the health and the level of living of Americans are to be maintained.

Experience has proved that neither an awareness on the part of the farmers of the need for conserving our national soil and water resources nor technical advice about the kind of conservation practices needed will get the job done, unless accompanied by measures which make it economically possible for the farmer to accomplish such practices. To maintain the strength of our Nation there are no more important appropriations than those for our overall conservation program.

The provisions for financial assistance to farmers to carry out the land use program proposed under the conservation reserve features of the soil bank proposal would provide an incentive to farmers to cooperate in making this program a success. Under the program the Government would bear a fair share of the costs involved in establishing a suitable cover. As farmers reorganize their farms along these soil conserving lines, they would be eligible to receive annual payments for a period of years related to the length of time needed to establish the new use of the land.

The acreage reserve phase of the soil-bank proposal has been referred to as a deferred-production plan. It would be voluntary and temporary, and generally aimed at reducing production, and hence carryover, of those agricultural products which are currently in greatest surplus. Under the plan as originally introduced, it was contemplated that it would be applied to such crops as wheat, cotton, corn, and rice and would remain in operation until carryover stocks of these commodities have been reduced to desirable levels.

The essence of the proposed program is that farmers would voluntarily reduce production of specified crops below their allotted acreage. The acreage withheld from production of any specific crop would be placed in the reserve. In return for placing a part of his allotted acres in the reserve, the farmer would receive as compensation certificates which would be redeemable by the Commodity Credit Corporation in cash or in kind. The basis for the value of the certificates would be the normal yield on the designated reserve acres.

This phase of the program would serve to achieve at least two important objectives: First, reduce surpluses, and second, encourage soil conservation. Much of the land now being used to produce

crops in excess of domestic, export, and normal carryover requirements would be devoted to producing soil-building crops. The compensation received by farmers for cooperating in the program would reimburse them for their loss of production on the acres placed in the reserve.

The operation of the soil-bank program would beyond a doubt improve the economic position of the agricultural sector of our economy. I would like to mention but a few of the ways in which this would be accomplished: First, storage costs would be reduced as surpluses are reduced; second, as surpluses are reduced and supplies again are held at desirable levels market prices will tend to rise to legal support levels or even above established price support levels, thus giving farmers greater returns on that output produced on fewer acres; third, the compensatory payments will increase farm income.

It should be noted that the compensatory payments will be partly offset by savings on storage costs as surpluses are reduced to reasonable levels.

It is conceivable that within 2 or 3 years if farmers cooperate in the acreage-reserve program, and 15 to 20 million acres of the land devoted to the crops now in greatest surplus are taken out of production of those crops, assuming normal yields, surpluses would be reduced sufficiently to result in a supply situation that would result in higher market prices. The higher market prices together with the soil-bank payments under the conservation reserve and the acreage reserve would probably provide a higher net return to producers of many of the crops to which the program may be applied. While any statements one might make with respect to the extent of the economic benefits of this program are at present hypothetical, it is, nevertheless, logical to conclude that the benefits will be substantial.

Current pending legislation with respect to the acreage reserve places a limit of \$800 million per year on expenditures under this phase of the program.

The proposed soil bank program has received widespread endorsement from conservation groups and leading farm organizations. While there may be differences of opinion with respect to specific details of its operation, there appears to be more or less general endorsement of the concept of the soil bank as such. I would like to quote the following views of leaders of farm organizations and conservation groups concerning the soil bank program made at hearings of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Mr. Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation stated:

For the past 3 years the American Farm Bureau Federation has been on record in favor of what we have called a soil-bank program, by which we mean that we should utilize our surplus productive capacity so that farmers would store fertility in the soil rather than to produce surpluses for the Commodity Credit Corporation. * * *

The basic purpose of the surplus reduction and soil-bank plan, as we conceive it, is to bring about at the earliest feasible date a

balance between annual supply and effective demand and to make more rapid progress toward the liquidation of current surplus stocks.

Mr. Herschel D. Newsom, master, National Grange, had the following to say with respect to the soil-bank program:

The Grange has long recognized and repeatedly stated that a form of land rental type program—preferably as closely related as we can honestly relate it to a long-range, sound soil-conservation objective—has a real place in both emergency type farm legislation and in long-term permanent legislation.

* * * The acreage reserve program, seems basically sound and substantially in accord, we believe—on a hasty and superficial examination of its contents—with Grange program and policy and with the above three-point program, insofar as our present Government-held stocks are concerned.

Mr. Charles H. Callison, conservation director, National Wildlife Federation, made the following statement:

We foresee in this proposal, this plan to authorize or implement the setting aside of certain acreages on the farms of the Nation for conservation practices, these acres to be taken out of production of general farm crops and livestock, great benefits in the conservation of our natural resources, not only the soil and water resources, but those related resources.

This plan is bound to have extremely important, and beneficial wildlife effects, because in these areas which may be set aside as an acreage reserve or as a soil bank, which areas will be left ungrazed and uncropped, you are bound to produce excellent farm game cover.

Not only that, it will help control the runoff and check soil erosion which is detrimental to fish in the streams of the watersheds.

If there is included in the program the idea that has been advanced for a timber bank, and we hope that it is included, we can see even greater benefits from the standpoint of wildlife production, because the planting of trees, the reforestation of marginal areas on farms that are suitable for that type of use, will produce cover for many kinds of wildlife.

We feel that any comprehensive-conservation program must take into consideration not narrowly just the soil and water, but all the natural products of the land.

Mr. Joseph W. Penfold, conservation director, Izaak Walton League of America, Denver, Colo., said:

We have been interested in it for quite some time. As a matter of fact, our original committee started in Illinois something more than 3 years ago working on a soil-bank plan. * * *

At our last national convention, last spring, the membership, through their delegates, adopted some general principles of the soil-bank plan. * * * In our several years of developing the idea and discussing it with farm people and others all over the country—we have not stressed the wildlife aspects for a couple reasons: One of them, because we think the soil-bank plan is a very important and worthwhile program aside from wildlife angles; and also, if we were to come out stressing wildlife, they would immediately assume that our interest was strictly wildlife, which is not the case.

* * * We see the opportunity as well as responsibility in our State game and fish departments to cooperate in this program so that the maximum values are achieved with the minimum of costs.

I feel that this soil-bank program is worthy of our wholehearted support, and that it should be enacted at an early date

so that it can be put into operation during this crop year. I feel confident that if enacted it will be an important step in the direction of improved soil conservation, surplus reduction, and higher farm income.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit on Monday and Tuesday of next week during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDowell] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, never before have the ideals of democracy been in greater danger. Even though we are being placated with words of ever increasing optimism, we must not be unaware of the very obvious dangers of becoming engulfed by the godless forces of communism. This day, the 165th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, should serve as a grave reminder that basic freedoms, so long envisioned as the political salvation of man, can be destroyed by the forces of communism. On this anniversary we honor those foresighted and fearless Polish people who adopted this constitution. It is based on the idea of individual liberty which is the foundation of democracy upon which all freedom-loving people rely.

The history of Poland's progress has been interrupted time and again by aggressors of every form. Of recent date, September 1939, the Nazis swarmed over Poland. In the face of hopeless odds the Polish people stood their ground and defended their land and ideals. However it was merely a matter of time before the defenses of Poland could no longer stand against the mighty onslaught of the Nazi war machine because the assistance that might have come from Russia was not there. During the Nazi occupation hundreds of examples of courage and resistance came to the attention of the people throughout the world and once again the national loyalty and patriotism of the Poles was an inspiration to the world. In 1945 a coalition government was set up and at this point Russia politically swallowed up Poland and the forces of democracy were systematically liquidated. In the face of all these setbacks the minds and hearts of the people still carried thoughts of freedom.

These oppressed people have long suffered at the hands of tyranny and except for their great fortitude and consuming

love of freedom even their ideals might have capitulated. However, because of their strength these ideals will never be extinguished. As long as the people of Poland continue to hold in their hearts this great desire for freedom the forces of communism will never be completely triumphant. People with strength such as this are a source of inspiration and a beacon of hope for those in other oppressed areas who will some day regain their God-given birthright—freedom.

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Thompson] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my most sincere support to the many Members who have spoken today in commemoration of Polish Constitution Day. At a time when our Government has found it necessary to warn the Embassy of the present regime in Poland not to interfere with the right of Polish people to live in asylum in the United States, it is particularly fitting to honor the May constitution of 1791, which has stood as a beacon of democracy throughout previous periods of reaction and national servitude in Polish history.

Americans of every national descentance can be proud, along with our Polish-American and Polish exile compatriots, of the May constitution which was proclaimed 165 years ago. Many of the political institutions which were so daringly adopted by our own Constitution 2 years earlier, and which we have been so uniquely fortunate in preserving ever since, were contained in the glorious document which the threatened Polish nation brought forth in 1791. It was clearly declared that all power in civil society was derived from the will of the people. Religious freedom was guaranteed. The powers of government were divided between 3 branches, as in our own, and the legislative branch was established in 2 houses.

The Polish people were not blessed with the natural defenses against their predatory neighbors which have helped us to preserve our Constitution without interruption. The flame of democracy in their country has been repeatedly suffocated by the squeeze of neighbors who have moved upon her in concert and from every side. Yet we know as we commemorate Polish Constitution Day, as we know from studying the heroic efforts which Polish patriots throughout the centuries, in the time of Pulaski and Kosciuszko, as staunchly as in the days of Paderewski or Sikorski, have made in the cause of democracy and freedom, that here is a people who will not be dismayed or halted by periods of political subservience. The principles which their constitution so strongly upheld, only 2 years following our own, will triumph once again among the Polish people, for

they are deeply rooted, and the Polish nation has demonstrated under repeated tyranny by its neighbors that its will for national freedom to live under these principles can withstand the most cruel and interminable suppression.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Sadlak] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, today is Polish Constitution Day. But the whole world knows that Poland today is not governed by any constitution, much less their original declaration of 1791. And the world also knows or at least can imagine the bitter persecution and pressure inflicted on the freedom-loving Poles at the hands of Soviet Communist Russia. Perhaps the most vivid remembrance of Red bestiality is the infamous Katyn Massacre at which the cream of the Polish Army, 14,000 regular officers, were lined up with their hands tied behind them, and shot through the backs of their heads after sawdust had been stuffed into their mouths.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the character of a government allegedly seeking peaceful coexistence with the world. A government which fiendishly exploits the hearts and the souls of any unfortunate people who fall victim to their might. This is a government whose history is replete with broken promises, deception, and betrayal, and whose own people respect them because of fear and reprisal.

Poland's plight is known to the world, and it's becoming a habit to express compassion with Poland. But the Poles do not want compassion; they want comprehension. Here was once a powerful nation which in the 15th, 16th, and 17th centuries was one of the dominant economic and military powers of Europe, acting as an effective barrier to barbaric invasion from the east and the south. In the height of her power, she defeated the Tartars, Teutonic Knights, Turks, Swedes as well as periodic victories over the Russians, one such success ending with the capture of Moscow. The only mistake Poland made was not capitalizing on her victories because her inherent love of freedom would not permit conquest by the sword and occupation of other nations. Students of Polish history must inevitably arrive at the conclusion that aggressive wars are almost completely absent from its pages.

But Poland's nonaggression policies could not survive her precarious geographic position. And even the stubborn courage and magnificent bravery of the Polish people could not withstand repeated attacks on her frontiers. The Russians do not forget the Polish will to fight and still smart, from their defeat at the Battle of Warsaw as late as 1920.

These historic facts perhaps explain the exceptionally inhuman treatment of Poland today and the main reason why Russia has embarked upon a ruthless plan to exterminate the entire Polish nation. They have executed Polish leaders, deported patriots, and maintain a constant iron rule over the people enforced by machineguns and reprisal.

Even the children are in the care of the state, and indoctrinated with Communist ideology directed against their parents' memories.

Napoleon referred to Poland as "the cornerstone of Europe." But the meaning of his words is better explained by Hilaire Belloc, the well-known contemporary Catholic author who writes:

Poland is the test of Europe. The restoration and preserving of a powerful and independent Polish state is, and must be, among the very first of our political objectives—if we cannot restore Poland it will mean that the forces destructive of all by which we have lived, have triumphed. Our descendants will no longer be able to call themselves civilized men, inheritors of the Roman Empire and of Greece through the strength of the Catholic Church and through its power to preserve. The very magnitude of the issue makes it difficult to grasp. The statement of it sounds so exaggerated as to be fantastic. We stand or fall by Poland; and "we" means all our art, literature, philosophy, all the mighty heritage now at stake.

Today is May 3, Polish Constitution Day, Mr. Speaker, commemorating a document inspired by the American Declaration of Independence passed by the Polish Parliament in 1791 and immediately followed by a national uprising led by Thaddeus Kosciuszko. Unlike ours, in which Kosciuszko also led, the Polish revolution failed. We in the United States enjoy the greatest freedom of any country in the world, developed under our Constitution. Without their constitution, Poland is suffering one of the greatest attempted purges and race annihilations of modern times.

I am confident that this attempt like so many before will fail, though not without bloodshed, persecution, and inhuman butchery. But the valiant courageous spirit of the Poles with their historic tradition will survive and that this indomitable will exists is readily characterized by the first line of the Polish national anthem which, in my opinion, tells the future as well as the history of this great nation. "Poland is not yet lost."

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman on his speech and join with him in celebration of Polish Constitution Day.

Mr. Speaker, 165 years ago, the people of Poland were given a constitution.

The Polish Constitution of 1791 contained this significant statement:

All power in civil society is derived from the will of the people.

These are almost the same words—it is the same thought—as contained in the American Declaration of Independence of 1776:

Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Poland and the United States, from the very outset of their constitutional history, have been irrevocably dedicated to an identical principle, that "all men are created equal."

Polish Constitution Day is on May 3. The Communist oppressors of Poland

have abolished the observance of Polish Constitution Day even as they have abolished the Polish Constitution. In 1956, it is a criminal offense to honor the birth of freedom in Poland. Americans are aware of that. All free peoples everywhere join in that awareness. Because the Polish people cannot openly pay their tribute to liberty, we who can speak freely will do it for them. All hail to May 3—the anniversary of the annunciation of Polish freedom.

Americans know what the Polish Constitution means.

There are more than 6 million Americans of Polish ancestry. There are approximately the same number of Americans who are proud of their heritage of Polish blood in Chicago today, as there were citizens of Warsaw previous to World War II. These Americans of Polish descent tell their friends, their children, their non-Polish wives and husbands the vital meaning of the constitution of 1791.

This is the reason that present-day Americans know that the original Polish constitutional convention was composed of noblemen who curtailed their own powers, delegating them to the people. This is the reason we know that the fathers of the Polish constitution made provision for the gradual transfer of land holdings to the tenant farmers. This is the reason that we know that the greatest urge of the Polish patriot—whether he is in or out of Poland—is to be free.

Instead of delegating their powers to the Polish people, their Communist oppressors have taken away all rights of self-government. Instead of being examples of the equality of man, the Communist oppressors of Poland have forced these brave people to live on scraps, freeze in substandard housing, toil in forced labor camps while they—the oppressors—live in luxurious villas, feast on delicacies, and loll at their ease. Instead of giving land to the farmers, the Communist oppressors have taken what land they did possess.

All Americans have been shocked and angered by the religious persecution of the Polish people by their oppressors. We know that the Communists have struck at the church with fire and sword and imprisonment. We know that they have tried—and failed—to substitute a progressive church movement. We know that this false movement, this sham, has been boycotted by the vast majority of the Polish people who are opposed to all of its activities and aims.

The Polish people have never bowed to anyone. As they resisted Nazi aggression in the past, they are today resisting Communist enslavement. This resistance is not a futile shooting war. It is a silent, moral, resistance of the spirit.

There is no lull in this battle. The peasant resists who opposes collectivization. The worker resists who refuses to be forced into labor speedups. The father and mother resist who tell their children of Poland's proud tradition and glorious history. The priest resists by spreading the Gospel of Christ, the arisen. The intellectual resists by adding to the freedom of thought.

Peasant, worker, parent, priest, and intellectual—all are part of the struggle for Polish liberty which communism will never be able to win. One hundred and sixty-seven million Americans share the prayers, the hopes, the aspirations for the day when Poland will again be free.

A century ago, the Polish hero, Mickiewicz, wrote:

Poland, you will be taken out of the tomb because you are believing, loving, and full of hope.

With all my heart, I believe in the truth of these ringing words.

Today—on Polish Constitution Day—Poles may not openly celebrate.

But, on this day, we in the United States join our Polish brothers in arms in the pledge that the struggle for the equality of man, for his dignity and for his God-given rights, will never end until—with the help of God—it is brought to a victorious conclusion.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply impressed by the address of my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut. I am mindful of his intense dedication to his assignment as a Representative in the Congress of the United States. I know something of his services to our country both in time of war and in time of peace. I am mindful, too, that he is himself of Polish extraction. In fact, he is one who has in recent years been teaching me some Polish words that I might use in speaking to my own constituency, so many of whom are of Polish extraction.

Mr. Speaker, today, Thursday, May 3, the sons and daughters of Poland throughout the world are marking the 165th anniversary of the day when that proud nation established its constitution after centuries of ruthless oppression.

This freedom, it is true, was short-lived, but once the fires of freedom have been kindled in the breasts of men they never wholly die. Iron heels of dictators may trample them and the heavy mantle of slavery may stifle their glow, but like the mythical phoenix rising from the ashes, the flames of freedom will blaze forth in new glory at the first expeditious moment.

The brave people of Poland are hoping against hope that in the new look being introduced by the de-deification of Stalin their hour of deliverance may be near at hand. There are encouraging signs in this direction, in the recent ousting by Poland's Communist government of two of its top purgers, and its reported plans to grant amnesty to some 70,000 political prisoners. But these faint glimmerings must not be interpreted too readily as the harbinger of the dawn. They may be only a false dawn preceding still more hours of darkness. However, the Soviet's new look should be an incentive to all Americans, all free people, to take up the challenge and insist that the Communist leaders back up their words with action.

Commenting on the new Communist policy before the American Association of Newspaper Editors a few nights ago,

President Eisenhower warned that "many of the wrongs of Stalin against other nations still prevail," that the "satellite nations of Eastern Europe"—and Poland is one—"are still ruled by Soviet puppets."

Said the President—

We must seek by every peaceful means to induce the Soviet bloc to correct existing injustice and genuinely to pursue peaceful purposes in its relations with other nations. * * * We must be tireless in our efforts to remedy these injustices and to resolve the disputes that divide the world. We will not grow weary in our quest for peaceful remedies for the enslavement or wrongful division of once-free nations.

We cannot doubt that the current of world history flows toward freedom. In the long run dictatorship and despotism must give way.

This then is our pledge to Poland as she marks the 165th anniversary of Polish Constitution Day. This is our pledge to all nations, split apart and enslaved, and to that end we will bend our strength, confident that in due time—

These things shall be—a loftier race

Than e'er the world hath known shall rise
With flame of freedom in the souls

And light of knowledge in their eyes.

Mr. SADLAK. May I commend my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], who has just spoken. I believe he is the Member of the House whom I have known longer than any other. I, too, am cognizant of his deep love and respect for the Polish constituency he has. I know his intense feeling on this particular occasion.

I can recall that he visited me when I was in the Navy during World War II. In fact, I look back to that occasion when a group of colleagues in the House had come to Shanghai in the course of an investigation, and it was there that I had the happy privilege of again meeting the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], whom I had known for so many years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, this day marks the anniversary of the establishment of the constitution of a once proud, free, and independent nation, a longtime friend of the United States—the Republic of Poland.

We Americans feel very close to the people of Poland. Millions of her fine people migrated to America in years past. They have made outstanding contributions to the building of a greater and nobler civilization in this great land. It is in no small measure because of the contributions of the sons and daughters of Poland that the United States has become the leading power of the world.

Such names as Pulaski, Sobieski, and Kosciuszko have an unforgettable and a revered place in the hearts of the liberty-loving people of America. They serve to remind us on such occasions as this of our debt to men of Polish blood. Lovers of liberty themselves, they battled for the liberty of America.

This occasion varies from other observances of Polish Constitution Day, since Poland has been the prisoner of ruthless, aggressive Communist dictator-

ship. There is this important difference: There has been a decided switch in the Soviet propaganda line. The new rulers of Russia have been systematically trying to convince the world that they are a group of pure do-gooders; that all the evils of Communist oppression were interred with the bones of Joe Stalin.

I have always believed that actions speak louder than words. "By their deeds ye shall know them." We could suggest to the rulers of the Kremlin a series of actions which they could take to prove to the world that they have reformed.

At this time, on the occasion of Polish Constitution Day, I shall mention just one action they could take which would give substance to their professions.

I urge that they announce to the world that they will permit the people of Poland to have a plebiscite, a free election in which they will have the right to choose between their Communist masters and a government of free men and women. If they will do this for Poland and the other Eastern European states which they have illegally seized, we will then begin to believe that the new rulers of Russia are a different breed than the predecessors they are now so vigorously condemning.

But until this happens let us remember that Poland is a captive land. And let us send word to her people that we, the people of America, will never be reconciled to her enslavement by Communist Russia. Let us remind her in her hours of despair that her brave people have before thrown off the chains of oppressors. With patience, courage, hope, and determination, she will do so again.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Poland's Constitution Day deserves recognition in America where so many sons of Poland have made their home and where constitutional government is such a cherished tenet. The Founding Fathers of America gave an example to the world when they met in Philadelphia and produced the American Constitution and established a just Government of, by, and for the people.

The people of Poland were well on their way to achieving a similar form of freedom and justice in their government when outside forces from which they could not protect themselves stood in the way. Lovers of freedom, however, hope for the day when Poland may again see a rebirth of freedom under the type of constitution whose establishment is today being commemorated.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, to all lovers of freedom May 3 stands as a sacred day. For on that day in 1791, the constitution of Poland was adopted. May 3, 1956, however, marks a melancholy day for the Polish people. As so often in their history, they groan today under the yoke of an oppressive tyrant. But characteristically, the will of the Polish people to be free remains strong.

Much has been written and much has been said of Poland's long and glorious struggle to establish and preserve her independence. As a result, perhaps, insufficient credit has been given to her people's age-old and honorable fight for the recognition of the dignity of the individual and his God-given right to live and work and die as a free man.

The record of the Poles' passionate attachment to human freedom is an ancient and enviable one. Long before our forefathers founded this land and dedicated it to the proposition that all men are created equal, there was flourishing in Poland a strong tradition of democracy and social justice.

The achievement of freedom for Poland came only after years of determined effort. The work of many dedicated patriots—the names Frye-Modrzewski and Stanislas Staszic stand out—eventually bore fruit, culminating in 1791 with the constitution of May 3.

That great product of Polish democracy in action evoked the acclaim of humanitarians everywhere. It is ranked among the peerless documents in human progress, along with the Magna Charta and our own Declaration of Independence. Ironically, its very greatness precipitated the extinction of Poland as a political entity. Poland's neighbors, fearing that their own despotic rule might be in danger, dismembered Poland in the partitions of 1793 and 1795.

So Poland fell, not because she could not live, but because she chose to stick by her democratic ideals. She chose to stand as a nation in which her citizens were free. The only alternative was enslavement.

Events in Poland's history from the last decade of the 18th century to the restoration of independence after World War I provide ample proof that far from losing their faith in democracy, the Polish people cherished and were sustained by that faith in the long years of the fearful ordeal of foreign rule. During these years the words and example of Adam Mickiewicz shine forth as beacons of liberty.

When World War I ended and the long-awaited restoration of an autonomous Poland was finally achieved, it was as a democracy that the Polish State was reconstituted. And, although surrounded by the totalitarian ideologies of communism and nazism, it was as a proud and resolute democracy that Poland lived until the start of World War II.

The years since 1939 have been trying and tragic ones for Poland. These times have shown, however, that the love of the people for freedom is undying. These times have shown that the Polish people are at their noblest in times of adversity.

The redoubtable Stanislas Staszic once uttered these immortal words:

Even a great nation may fall, but only a worthless one can perish.

Mr. Speaker, Poland, though fallen, has decidedly not perished. The religious fervor of her people, coupled with their long tradition of national aspiration toward freedom has made for a strong stand against Soviet tyranny.

Their resistance has become today a built-in, integral part of their lives. It shows itself in their steadfast adherence to the church, in the refusal of the peasant population to join collectives despite heavy pressures, in continued escapes to the West of citizens from all walks of life, and in the rebellious criticism of the Communist regime which appears at the slightest opportunity.

The qualities which have preserved the Polish people throughout history assist them today. The dauntless determination which for centuries has characterized their spirit—their love of the native soil, their devotion to family and to God, their tenacity, their undying faith in liberty, and their patriotism—these qualities will survive all attempts at suppression.

As we hope and pray on this occasion for the resurrection of a free Poland, let us recall the words of the immortal Mickiewicz in his epic *Forefathers' Eve*:
But soon will shine the sun of liberty,
And from the West a wind will warm this land.

Will the cascade of tyranny then stand?

Mr. Speaker, as we pause to honor Polish Constitution Day, we pray that the sun of liberty will soon shine on the noble people of Poland. We pray that the end of tyranny and the rebirth of national freedom will soon be a reality.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLIOTT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, we are celebrating today, the anniversary of a great national holiday of the Polish people, the 165th anniversary of the adoption of its constitution. The Poles take pride in the fact that their national holiday commemorates an event which is not connected with any military conquest, but rather with the achievement of a milestone in democratic government—a charter of human liberty. In 1791 Poland was surrounded by powers practicing oppression and tyranny, and threatening its existence. And it was in such an atmosphere that this great liberal constitution was adopted, recognizing the equality of all men, proclaiming religious liberty and establishing by basic law the freedom of thought and speech.

It was not destined that Poland was to endure long after the adoption of this great constitution. The tyrants of Russia, Austria, and Prussia would not tolerate this bold flowering of human spirit. They could not permit, in close proximity to their territory, the spectacle of human dignity, worth and freedom—this cultivation of the dangerous doctrine of democracy. And so Poland was extinguished as a nation, not to arise again until a great American President, Woodrow Wilson, resurrected it in 1918, by proclaiming a great American doctrine that every people had the inherent God-given right to determine its own national destiny.

The torch of liberty is again extinguished in Poland today—this despite

the fact that the Polish nation has contributed so richly in every struggle of this modern world for freedom and liberty.

For us Americans, in considering the fate that has befallen Poland, it is important that we bear in mind what her fate means to us and to our own future national security.

There have been, and still are, grave errors committed by us in evaluating the full scope and ultimate goal of the forces that have overridden not only Poland, but all of Central Europe, most of Asia and many other parts of the world.

Surely it must now be obvious to all of us that the mask has been stripped from the face of Communist aggression, and underneath it we find the grim countenance of Soviet world imperialism which threatens to engulf all of the world, including the United States, unless we clearly understand the threat to our own safety and take steps to protect ourselves from that fate which Poland has met.

Let us first all take sober cognizance of the fact that our own country was a participant in the pacts which resulted, though we did not so intend it, in the enslavement of Poland and other countries in Europe and Asia. These pacts, which are underlying causes for the unrest now existing in the world, should certainly be repudiated by our Nation as an indication of our good faith and our determination for a realistic approach to the problem of securing world peace and justice.

In the past the Communists have resorted to many subtle and clever schemes to lull the western democracies into a false feeling of security and into a belief that the phase of Communist world imperialism is over and that we can expect a true era of peaceful coexistence. It must be conceded that these efforts of the Communist leadership have been eminently successful in the past. The Russians have always been masters in the skill with which they have conducted their propaganda and they have clearly demonstrated that in their dealings with us.

If there should be any doubt about the fact, let us consider what they did to us at Geneva. It was the "spirit of Geneva" which has been their most powerful weapon in undermining the unity of the Western democracies, confusing our loyal allies to the extent that they are unable to determine what course we are following and weakening their resistance to Communist overtures.

Then came the sudden change of the countenances of Khrushchev and Bulganin, from sullen scowls to beaming smiles intended merely to dupe us into a false belief that a sudden magic transformation has taken place in Soviet aims, when actually nothing whatever has changed except the type of strategy now to be used to eventually secure our enslavement.

And the final diabolically clever maneuver is the so-called end of Stalinism. Now we are asked to believe the sincerity of Communist leaders, who only yesterday hailed Stalin as a god and today condemn him in terms which have

been reserved usually for bitter enemies of communism.

Certainly we should be intelligent enough to understand these latest maneuvers as merely a reorganization of internal Communist life to suit their purposes. They have nothing whatsoever to do with any lessening of Soviet tyranny, with any guaranty of free elections or of personal freedom to enslaved nations or with any abandonment of the goal of world domination.

The free world has always known that Stalin was the greatest murderer and tyrant in modern history, with the possible exception of Hitler. We did not need this sudden burst of sincerity of his colleagues and henchmen to tell us that.

But if there is any sincerity in this new Soviet maneuver, then why not show it by undoing the terrible wrongs that Stalin has committed. Stalin violated every international treaty signed by the Soviet Government. In violation of the most solemnly signed non-aggression pacts he invaded and occupied Poland, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and East Germany. Why not permit these oppressed satellite peoples to have the free elections, supervised by the United Nations?

Then, and only then, will the free world begin to take seriously the new assurances given us by the exponents of communism.

I am pleased to note that on the occasion of this Polish Constitution Day, the State Department has issued a statement reaffirming its assurance that the United States are not reconciled to the bondage of Poland. Such statement, however, could gain strength and importance if it were accompanied by acts of strength and realization of the dangers of world communism. There is little comfort in the information made public only yesterday by Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, commander-in-chief of the Strategic Air Command, that we are dropping behind Soviet Russia in airpower and in his prediction that within 2 years Soviet Russia will have a stronger global striking force than we can command.

On this anniversary of the Polish Constitution Day, I want to add my voice of tribute to a great Polish nation, to add my prayers for an early day of restoration of full freedom and independence. But, as an American, I pray also that this great American Nation shall take a lesson from the terrible tragedy which has befallen the Poles, that it shall always act in full strength and realization that that same fate will some day be ours unless we recognize the powerful sinister forces of communism threatening us and act with the daring and courage which characterized the founders of the United States of America.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

KATYN RESOLUTION

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on this, the 165th anniversary of the adoption of Poland's Constitution for freedom and liberty, it is fitting and proper to again draw to the attention of the Nation and

the world facts concerning Poland's present battle against the Communist tyrants now overrunning their lands. It was also very appropriate that this legislative day was opened with prayer by Father Valerian Karcz, of Lake County, Ind. Father Karcz is secretary general of the Polish-American Congress.

On January 9, 1953, as chairman of the Katyn Forest Massacre Committee, I filed House Resolution 63, which requested that the President and the State Department forward to the United Nations the testimony, evidence, and findings of the select committee created by House Resolution 390. At the request of the State Department, owing to the fact that the Korean Treaty negotiations were then pending between the Communist Chinese Government and our Government, no action was taken on House Resolution 63.

Today I am filing a similar resolution, asking that the House of Representatives request the President to ask the State Department to forward all the testimony, evidence, and findings of the Katyn Select Committee to the General Assembly of the United Nations. I am further asking in this resolution that the State Department convey information to the present Communist Government in Poland that all the testimony, evidence, and findings of the House Select Committee which investigated the Katyn Forest massacre be sent to the Polish Communist Government to aid them in their investigation which they are about to undertake in order to establish to their satisfaction that former Premier Stalin ordered and directed the massacre of 15,000 Polish leaders in the Katyn Forest and the two other Soviet prison camps.

Congressman MACHROWICZ, Congressman Flood, and I, as former members of the Katyn Select Committee, are taking this step because of the following dispatch over the Associated Press wires last Thursday, April 26, 1956. I hereby set out the AP dispatch verbatim:

NEW YORK.—A report has seeped out from behind the Iron Curtain that the Polish Communist Government in Warsaw is investigating the Katyn Forest massacre. Analysis here of Soviet bloc happenings look askance at the suggestion the Polish Reds might dare to raise the specter of this hot issue. They doubt it can be true. Still, the report deserves attention because the Polish Communists are going much further these days in their denunciation of Stalin and his works than other Soviet satellites. Katyn Forest, in western Russia near Smolensk, was the scene of the mass murder in 1940 of more than 4,000 Polish army officers who had been missing since the Polish defeat in 1939. The Germans, who first reported the massacre during World War II, said the Russians did it. The Soviet Government retorted after an investigation that the Nazis did the killing. An American congressional committee held hearings for 9 months in 1951-52 and laid the massacre at the door of the Russians. The new report from Poland says the Warsaw Government has established a group to investigate the Katyn mass murders and can be expected to make a report in June, which might be made public.

The final report of the special Katyn investigating committee contained testimony, evidence, and findings which total 4 large volumes of sworn testimony

and several hundred exhibits. This testimony was recorded under oath from over 225 witnesses all of whom submitted valuable and essential information as to the truth about the Katyn Forest massacre of approximately 15,000 Polish leaders in the winter of 1939 and 1940.

This special committee held hearings in Washington, D. C., New York, Detroit, Chicago, London, Frankfurt, Germany, Naples, Italy, and Berlin. At the beginning of its testimony the committee invited the leaders of the Soviet Government as well as the leaders of the Polish Communist Government to appear before our committee here in Washington or Frankfurt, Germany, where hearings were held in 1952. Both governments refused this invitation and criticized our hearings as ridiculous and unnecessary. Stating in their rejection that informed people knew that the Nazis killed the Polish leaders at Katyn.

The Katyn Forest Massacre Committee revealed beyond all question of remote doubt that the 15,000 Polish leaders were massacred and murdered by the Soviet Government under the direction of Stalin and some of the present Communist leaders in the Kremlin.

Numerous witnesses revealed that this international crime was merely one of the great number of similar crimes to other captive nations in the Soviet drive for world domination.

We are learning that the present leaders in the Kremlin are now trying to place the guilt of the massacre and murder of millions of Polish people on the shoulders of the dead Stalin.

From the testimony of numerous witnesses before the Katyn committee facts were revealed by these witnesses who are well acquainted with the trickery and strategy of Communist leaders that the temporary changes of policy by the Communist Government does not and will not bring about a change in their original aim of world control.

Nevertheless, I wish to commend the Polish Communist Government for taking the step it is now taking to conduct an independent investigation of the Katyn Massacre and let the people of Poland know the true facts as to who killed the 15,000 Polish leaders at the beginning of World War II.

Therefore, Congressman MACHROWICZ, Congressman Flood, and I are sponsoring a resolution that our Government aid the Polish Communist Government in this investigation by placing at their disposal the volumes of sworn testimony which was recorded by the select committee investigating the Katyn Forest massacre during the 82d Congress.

I do hope that the Foreign Affairs Committee in the House of Representatives, the President, and the State Department will take favorable action on the resolution which we are filing today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate with my remarks, a copy of the resolution which I have this day filed. A similar resolution was today filed by Congressman MACHROWICZ, of Michigan, and Congressman Flood, of Pennsylvania, both Members having served on the special Katyn investigating committee in the 82d Congress,

Resolution

Whereas by House Resolution 390, 82d Congress, there was created a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the facts, evidence, and circumstances of the Katyn Forest massacre; and

Whereas in its final report to the House of Representatives (H. Rept. No. 2505, Dec. 22, 1952), the select committee recommended that the House adopt a resolution substantially as set forth below: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President is hereby requested—

1. to forward to the United States mission to the United Nations the testimony, evidence, and findings of the select committee, created by House Resolution 390, 82d Congress, to conduct an investigation and study of the facts, evidence, and circumstances of the Katyn Forest massacre;

2. to instruct the United States mission to the United Nations to present the case of the Katyn Forest massacre to the General Assembly of the United Nations;

3. that the Associated Press, in dispatches of April 26, 1956, stated that the Polish Communist Government is now about to make a special investigation of the facts concerning the Katyn Forest massacre in order to establish whether former Premier Joseph Stalin ordered and instigated this international crime. That the House of Representatives request the State Department to convey to the Polish Communist Government, through its Washington Embassy, that all the testimony, evidence, and findings of this special select committee, created by House Resolution 390, 82d Congress, be made available to the use and for the information of the Polish Communist Government in order to aid and facilitate the investigation which they are about to undertake in order to establish the true facts of the massacre of approximately 15,000 Polish leaders in the winter of 1939 and 1940.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this point to pay tribute to the gentleman from Indiana for the fine work he has done as chairman of the Katyn Massacre Committee, a committee which I believe has done more in the eyes of the world to show the true nature of communism than anything else I can think of.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House that our Capitol today was graced by the presence of that very distinguished Polish patriot, General Anders. If I am not mistaken, the gentleman from Michigan, now in the Well of the House, and the great general broke bread together.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. That is correct.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for the fine statement he has made. The hearts of the people of our country go out to Poland now. Brave Poles have marched with our men in every battle that has ever been fought by the people of the United States from the time America gained its

independence down to our most recent wars. Many of our outstanding American citizens are of Polish extraction. I desire to join with my colleague in the hope that Poland may be released from its bondage in the near future.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] may be permitted to extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is the day when in all lands those who love liberty and a form of democratic government that upholds the dignity of man and recognizes the Creator of both men and nations, turn their minds to Poland.

From the earliest colonial days men and women from Poland have played a vital role in the building of the United States of America into a citadel of democracy dedicated in the fullness of its strength to the cause of all peoples in their quest for liberty. It is fitting that here today in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States assurance again should be given to the people of Poland that we shall stand by with all our hearts and all our strength until again Poland is free and under God, a government, of, for, and by the people of Poland shall be marching forward to meet her rendezvous with destiny.

I wish to join with the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] in remarking the appropriateness of the opening of our session on this anniversary day by Father Val Karcz, himself born in Chicago in the district now so ably represented by our colleague the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman BOWLER; both his father and mother having been natives of Poland had emigrated to this land in the early youth. Father Karcz studied in Poland, taking 2 years of postgraduate work at Posen University. He is secretary general of the Polish American Congress, which represents over 6 million persons in this country, and is the pastor of Assumption parish in New Chicago in the district represented by our colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], to whom we are indebted for the presence with us on the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of one of Polish blood so distinguished in his service to God and to our country.

MAY 3 CONSTITUTION AND ITS MEANING TODAY

Few events in the history of Poland are held in such high regard as the proclamation of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791. This constitution held the seeds from which could grow a real democratic order. No wonder it is treasured in the mind and heart of every patriotic Pole.

It was Imperial Russia that destroyed this constitution and the promise of democracy it held for Poland, just as it is Soviet Russia that has destroyed Poland's hope of freedom today. The

commemoration of the May 3 constitution thus brings to mind not only the history of a great people; it also brings to mind the character of Polish-Russian relations.

Events in Russia have always had their repercussions in Poland, but this has been especially true since Poland fell under Communist domination. The most recent of these events affecting Poland is the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and this event may turn out to be the most portentous of all.

In Poland the attacks on Stalin have been leveled with greater intensity than anywhere else in the Soviet bloc. Before the congress, there had been a steady downgrading of Stalin, although Stalin was still regarded as a plaster saint in Communist hagiology. However, since the congress we have been witnessing the spectacle of Stalin being dethroned from his place of glory in the most blasphemous manner. The black deeds of the dead dictator have been given the widest publicity so that all Poles are able to share in the common assault. This development, far different from those in the other satellite states and even from those in Soviet Russia, where caution still predominates, is partially explained by the fact that Boleslaw Bierut, the Polish Communist leader who was beholden to Stalin for his success in Poland, died immediately after the congress ended. Thus, what might have been the principal obstacle to the outpouring of anti-Stalin sentiments was completely removed. The result is that the Poles have been able to criticize Stalin and the so-called "cult of personality" with impunity.

ANTI-RUSSIAN FEELING INNATE

Another explanation for the intensity of the Polish reaction lies in the innate anti-Russian feeling of the Polish people, which is inextricably woven into the fabric of anti-Stalinism. Patriotism has always been too deeply ingrained into the Polish soul for the Pole to accept Russian domination with any degree of equanimity or self-resignation.

For a decade Stalin had become a symbol of all the appurtenances of Russian rule and Communist oppression. Now Stalin has become the focal point of Polish recriminations. Unquestionably the current attacks on Stalin in Poland stem from a sort of psychological relief that comes when a people have suddenly been released from a heavy burden.

Unfortunately, the relief to the Poles is only psychological, because the Communist power positions remain strong and completely intact in Poland today. It is permissible to attack Stalin, but, as in the U. S. S. R., it is not permissible to attack basic Communist theory or policy.

RESPONSIBLE FOR KATYN MASSACRE

Nonetheless, the turn of events in Soviet Russia is by and large advantageous for Poland. The effects will in all probability be great. In one sense a chink might well have been created in the armor of Soviet control over Poland. Anti-Stalinism could become a rallying point for a broader anti-Russian cam-

paign. Taken to its logical conclusion the practice of attacking Stalin could pose some serious questions for the present regime.

Was Stalin responsible for the debacle of the Warsaw uprising? Was Stalin also responsible for the Katyn Massacre? We know that the responsibility for these outrages rests solely upon the former Soviet dictator. Now, perhaps, questions might be raised by Poles who want to know the truth.

And if the Polish Communist leaders charge Stalin with these crimes, as well they might, there is no doubt that the repercussions of anti-Soviet feeling would reach to the depths of the Polish nation.

Moscow may well have opened up a Pandora's box of woe when it launched the anti-Stalin campaign. In the U. S. S. R. the campaign has already aroused deep-seated skepticism and latent resentment. In Poland it will surely quicken the Polish national spirit and stir up deep-rooted Polish animosities against the Russians. Forces have been let loose which Moscow may not be able to control. Surely in the case of Poland there is reason to be hopeful.

NOTE OF HOPEFULNESS

It is on this note of hopefulness that we should celebrate today. The history of modern Poland is a history of national struggle for survival, and the May 3 constitution is a symbol of this struggle. More than that, it is a symbol of the Polish ideal: To establish a free, independent, democratic state in Poland. Periods in Polish history have been enshrouded with the gloom of oppression; but somehow the Polish people have kept alive the light of hope that was created on May 3, 1791. However dismal conditions may be in Poland today, I do not doubt that this same light of hope for a better day and for a better Poland still burns within the Polish soul. In the last analysis it is this light, this hope of self-regeneration, that is the Pole's true salvation.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today, Americans of Polish extraction celebrate the 165th anniversary of the signing of the Polish National Constitution. The Polish Constitution was the first written constitution adopted by the people of a nation subsequent to our own. Our own Constitution was adopted by the last of the Original Thirteen States on May 29, 1790.

The Constitution of Poland recognized that all power in a civil society is derived from the will of the people. It accepted the principle of the division of civil authority into the legislative, the executive, and the judicial branches. It recognized the principle of religious tolerance, as follows:

For as the same sacred faith enjoins on us to love our neighbors, therefore, we should guarantee to all people peace in the faith their Government protects and to have freedom to all rights of religion in the Polish lands according to the country's laws.

It is pertinent to observe that this constitutional mandate, like our own, recognizes the separation of church and state yet concedes that this tolerance is predicated upon a divine command.

The fact that their constitution was conceived by the Polish people shortly after our own is by no means a matter of accident. For no people have suffered more in the cause of freedom than have the Polish people. The history of the Polish people is a continual struggle for freedom from oppression, but a struggle carried on with godly dignity and lack of malice. In commenting upon the Polish May 3 Constitution, and comparing the struggle of the Polish people for their constitution with that of the French for their freedom, Edmund Burke, the great English statesman, disclosed that the Polish people achieved their constitution with great dignity while the French Revolution was stained by indignities. Burke said of the Polish Constitution of May 3:

Not one man incurred loss, or suffered degradation. All, from the king to the day laborer, were improved in their condition. Everything was kept in its place and order; but in that place and order everything was bettered. To add to this happy wonder (this unheard-of conjunction of wisdom and fortune) not one drop of blood was spilled; no treachery; no outrage; no system of slander more cruel than the sword; no studied insults on religion, morals, or manners; no spoil; no confiscation; no citizen beggared; none imprisoned; none exiled; the whole was effected with a policy, a discretion, a unanimity, and secrecy, such as have never been before known on any occasion; but such wonderful conduct was reserved for this glorious conspiracy in favor of the true and genuine rights and interests of men.

Their struggle for independence left in the Polish people a love of freedom and liberty under God unparalleled in the world's history.

At the present time, the Polish land and Polish bodies are once again in the hands of a godless aggressor. However, the Polish spirit and Polish souls remain free.

We Americans, on the 165th anniversary of the Polish Constitution, ought rededicate ourselves to individual liberty under God everywhere. We ought reaffirm our expressed aim to do everything humanly possible to aid the subjugated but unconquered people of Poland. Poland will again be free. Let us pray that their liberation is soon. Let us pray that the liberation of Poland will be accomplished in the same manner that the Polish Constitution was effectuated, without a drop of blood being spilled, without treachery, without outrage, without slander, without studied insults on religion, morals or manners, without malice, without spoils, without confiscation, without imprisonment, without exile.

To achieve that end, we need God's help. But, if Poland's liberation is achieved in such a manner, true significance is given to the opening words of the Polish National Anthem, which have been described as the noblest words ever written in the Polish language:

Poland is not lost forever, while our lives remain.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY].

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join in the tribute which is

being so justly paid to the founding of the Polish constitution and to the ideals for which Poland has always stood. Particularly should we in the United States be grateful to Poland for her support in this war and for the many sons which she gave on the various battlefields of the war after she was torn asunder by Stalin and by Nazi Germany.

Now, however, that the major tyrants in the Kremlin have given themselves over to confessing the crimes of Mr. Stalin, and now that they have realized that confession is good for the soul—and never does the heel any harm either—it might be well if someday they would turn over their accomplices to the United Nations for trial. There is ample precedent for that in the Nuremberg trials where the Nazi leaders were tried for their crimes against humanity.

Now that Bulganin and Khrushchev are confessing that this base leader committed these crimes against humanity it might be well for them and for our State Department to call upon them to prove their sincerity before the bar of world justice by turning over to the United Nations for trial the war criminals now in existence in the Polish Government.

I recently had the pleasure and the distinct honor of making a trip with the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service and finding myself in Rome. The seminarians of the various nations studying for the priesthood wear on their cassocks sashes symbolic of their nations. I think it is a wonderful thing to know that the Irish seminarians who wear green sashes turned over their sashes to the Polish seminarians because green is the symbolic color of Poland, and so that the color may be of some inspiration to this race that so treasures liberty and who are justified in their faith that their nation will be restored to its rightful place among the nations of the earth.

Let me conclude by saying that I hope that our State Department will take the lead in calling upon these former accomplices of Stalin to bring before the bar of justice of the United Nations the men who make up the Polish Government, a pseudo government which is nothing more nor less than the alter ego of the Soviet nation. There is precedent in the United Nations for such action. Let us test the sincerity of these new leaders of the Soviets.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, today is a great day for a large segment of our population. A great day—but a sad day. If ever the term "mixed emotions" were to be applied to a situation, the observance of Polish Constitution Day would certainly be apropos. The people of Polish descent, here and abroad, will be both joyful and saddened on this May 3, for they must celebrate the greatest day in Polish history as they mourn for their homeland under the heel of one of the foulest, cruelest dictatorships the world has ever known.

It must be particularly galling to a nation such as Poland, to have yearned through the centuries for liberty—for the simple right to be let alone to live in peace with their neighbors—and then have a short-lived period of national sovereignty snatched from their very hands.

The history of Poland has been a hectic one, even from its earliest stages. In 1791, Poland declared to the world that all men are free and equal, adopted a constitution, and proceeded to establish a democratic legislature, curbed the heavy hand of the King, gave the peasants protection under the law, and brought about many other progressive changes. In less than 2 years, however, the covetous rulers of Prussia and Russia overran this new democracy, and occupied the country for 125 years.

The citizens of Poland, through this seemingly endless period of time, did not lose their national pride or thirst for freedom; in fact, it grew stronger. The fond hopes of a beleaguered people were realized in 1918, as Poland assumed once more her rightful status in the community of nations.

For two short decades, Poland was to know the joys of self-government and the dignity of man. Unfortunately, despotism was on the march, and the hobnailed boots of a tramping war machine were soon kicking at the gates of Warsaw. Poland was again to see brutality and murder on a national scale. To this day, she has known little else.

Americans of every nationality today send the enslaved people of Poland a message of deepest sympathy for the silent battle they wage, and pray that one day soon the yoke of bolshevik imperialism will be driven from the face of the globe.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years the House of Representatives has memorialized the 3d of May as the official date the Constitution of Poland was adopted in 1791. Today marks the 165th anniversary of that historical document. It disregarded class distinction, abolished restrictions on the freedom of the individual, and guaranteed religious tolerance. This was truly the first democratic constitution in all of Europe and a milestone in the development of parliamentary democracy.

Today, the desire for human rights and social justice, for democracy and religious freedom is stronger than it has ever been in the history of mankind. And, yet, the great paradox of history is the tragic fact the Polish people, which brought forth this noble document, cannot celebrate its anniversary in a free Poland today.

This nation that lived for almost 10 centuries in spiritual, religious, and cultural relationship with western nations, is now cut off from the West. It is shackled behind the Iron Curtain, where freedom is nonexistent; where human rights are disregarded and are

trampled upon; where social justice and religious toleration are unknown; where democracy has been removed, and is held in bondage by their tyrannical Communist overlords. For liberty-loving Americans, this anniversary of the signing of the Polish Constitution is an opportunity to tell the people of Poland that they have not been forgotten by the free world. We share with them the hope that the spirit of their constitution of 1791 will continue to serve them, not only as a source of strength, but also as an inspiration for a future democratic government when the shackles of Communist despotism have been cast off.

Certainly we in the United States cannot forget the Poles in their days of darkness. They did not forget us when we were 13 weak colonies struggling to free ourselves from British domination. Many Poles joined our ranks in the war for independence. Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko and Gen. Casimir Pulaski were two of the great generals in that war.

In the 165 years since that hopeful day when the Polish people proclaimed their constitution of 1791, there have been many reversals of freedom and fortune in that country. Few people have maintained their national integrity, their aspirations for freedom as the Polish people have. They have been helped in this by the encouragement of the people of this country, many of whom are related by blood to those who have maintained their spirit of freedom under the adverse conditions which exist today.

We as Members of Congress, and we as American citizens individually, do appreciate the blessings which have come to us through our Constitution. That being true, we would be unworthy of the freedom which has blessed us and which we are enjoying if we do not hold a constant purpose in our hearts and follow it in our actions, to restore freedom to Poland.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, May 3 is Polish Constitution Day, a day that should be faithfully acknowledged by every true friend of democracy. However, in the fanfare of gala celebrations the real historical significance of the holiday is often forgotten. For a moment then let us look into its historical background.

The Constitution of May 3, 1791, converted Poland into a hereditary limited monarchy, with ministerial responsibility and biennial parliaments. The liberum veto and all the intricate and obstructive machinery of the anomalous old system was forever abolished. All invidious class distinctions were done away with. The towns, in a special bill, confirmed by the new constitution, got full administrative and judicial autonomy, as well as a certain measure of parliamentary representation; the personal privileges of the gentry, such as the possession of land and access to office in the state and in the church, were thrown open to

the townsmen. The peasants were placed under the protection of the law and their serfdom was eased, preparatory to its entire abolition. Absolute religious toleration was established. Provision was made for further reforms by subsequent parliaments.

The reforms of May 3, 1791, were made possible through a spontaneous effort of the Polish people upon hearing that a fresh partition of their country was again in the offing. During the excitement of these tidings the king read out a proposed form of constitution drawn up by the patriotic party. The aristocracy begged the king to abandon his proposal, but the patriots rushed to the center of the assembly and demanded that the king should then swear to the new constitution, which he did in the Cathedral of St. John. The new act of reform was headed by the words, "All power in a state emanates from the people's will." All night the streets of Warsaw were ablaze proclaiming freedom and independence.

Ever since that eventful day in which the Polish people cast off the yoke of despotism, people of Polish ancestry throughout the world have observed the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791.

However, in the past decade the celebrations have not been as cheerful as might be expected, for Poland is once again a captive nation. Although Russia has now usurped all the civil liberties from the Polish people, the intangible factors such as morale, homogeneity, and love of country are still in the hearts of every Polish citizen. Poland, which has been dismembered so often by politically expedient partitions, will not let an atheistic concept break her will. As long as there are such men with ideas of freedom as Pulaski and Kosciuszko, who aided us in our own fight for independence, there will always be legions of leaders in Poland to break the yoke of oppression and become free again.

The Polish Communist Party, backed by the vast Russian war machine, has not been able to strangle the voice of freedom. Through the ruthless system of the Soviet secret police there have been mass murders and deportations to forced labor camps to break the never-dying Polish spirit. The Polish people are daily tortured in mind and body, yet their spirits and aspirations are undaunted. The Poles, who are intrinsically religious, are forbidden freedom of worship and are forcibly compelled to pay homage to the leaders of the "people's democratic state." Yet, knowing that they may be purged or imprisoned, the Poles still frequent the cathedrals and churches that are still open. We have also seen here in the United States the great contributions citizens of Polish descent have made to the American Republic. Without the technical, cultural, and physical attributes the people of Polish ancestry have given to the American scene we would not be the Nation we are. Therefore, on this anniversary of Polish Constitution Day, all freedom-loving people in the United States and throughout the whole world sincerely hope and trust that the days of Soviet domination will soon come to an end.

The American people at this time offer their moral support and encouragement to the Polish people and express the hope that the nightmare of Communist terrorism will be overthrown and the light of freedom will again shine over a free Poland.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper that on the day I introduce this resolution, there is present in this Chamber the great Polish leader, general, and hero, Gen. Wladyslaw Anders.

I am sure that down through the pages of history it will be recorded that one of the greatest leaders of any people of all times, and one of the great generals of world history, will be this brave and noble patriot, General Anders.

On this day of May 3, the anniversary day of the Polish Constitution, I pay this tribute to him and to his people and to his country, and assure him that my country stands at his shoulder, and we say to him, "Keep up your courage, keep your great faith, the belief in Polonia restituta is closer and closer to achievement."

It was while a member of the Katyn Massacre Investigating Committee that I first had the honor and privilege of meeting General Anders, and it is a bright coincidence and augurs well that on this May 3, in his presence, I introduce this resolution.

Resolution

Whereas by House Resolution 390, 82d Congress, there was created a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the facts, evidence, and circumstances of the Katyn Forest massacre; and

Whereas in its final report to the House of Representatives (H. Rept. No. 2505, December 22, 1952), the select committee recommended that the House adopt a resolution substantially as set forth below: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President is hereby requested—

1. To forward to the United States Mission to the United Nations the testimony, evidence, and findings of the select committee, created by House Resolution 390, 82d Congress, to conduct an investigation and study of the facts, evidence, and circumstances of the Katyn Forest massacre;

2. To instruct the United States Mission to the United Nations to present the case of the Katyn Forest massacre to the General Assembly of the United Nations;

3. To take such steps as may be necessary to express the desire of the United States that the General Assembly of the United Nations institute action before the International Court of Justice against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics because of the commission of mass murder in the Katyn Forest, in violation of the general principles of law recognized by civilized nations; and

4. To instruct the United States Mission to the United Nations to seek the establishment of an international commission to investigate other mass murders and crimes against humanity;

5. That the Associated Press, in dispatches of April 26, 1956, stated that the Polish Communist government is now about to make a special investigation of the facts concerning the Katyn Forest massacre in order to establish whether former Premier Joseph Stalin ordered and instigated this international crime. That the House of Representatives convey to the Polish Communist Government, through its Washington Embassy, that all the testimony, evidence, and

findings of this special select committee, created by House Resolution 390, 82d Congress, be made available to the use and for the information of the Polish Communist Government in order to aid and facilitate the investigation which they are about to undertake in order to establish the true facts of the massacre of approximately 15,000 Polish leaders in the winter of 1939 and 1940.

STATEMENT

I include at this point a statement made by me in the House earlier this week:

ANTI-STALIN MOVEMENT IN RUSSIA AND HER SATELLITE AREAS

(Mr. Flood asked and was given permission to address the House for 3 minutes.)

Mr. Flood. Mr. Speaker, we are now advised that there is some kind of a change in atmosphere in the Soviet and satellite areas with reference to an anti-Stalinist movement. As you know, Mr. Speaker, several years ago I served upon the House Committee To Investigate the Katyn Massacre. For 9 months in this country and various parts of Europe that committee of this House investigated the massacre of some 15,000 Polish reserve officers in Europe, in the early years of the war. This committee of this House placed the blame for that massacre upon Communist Russia.

The testimony we took in Frankfurt, Germany, and London, England, from members of the London-Polish Free Government in exile detailed conversations that members of that government had with Stalin himself in the Kremlin.

Mr. Speaker, I propose that the Secretary of State direct and order the American delegation to the United Nations to bring, as this House requested in its report, to the United Nations the resolution of this House and submit it to the United Nations with the request and the demand of our delegation that the United Nations consider the report and the resolution of this House on the Katyn Massacre Committee findings and that we recommend to the Polish Red government at Warsaw and to the Russian Soviet Government at Moscow that we will place in their hands, especially the Red Polish government, who now are preparing to conduct an investigation of the Katyn massacre, the report, the testimony, and the findings of this House with our compliments.

Nikita S. Khrushchev's desanctification of Stalin offers the free world its greatest opportunity since the Bolshevik Revolution.

If the American Government does not avail itself of the tremendous possibilities which range from the propaganda field to the possibility to roll back the Iron Curtain, the United States of America, the leading Nation in the world today, will rightly have lost its claim as the leader of the free world.

This is the situation in a historical moment which calls more than any other moment in the history of American-Soviet relations for the greatest vision, initiative, and the swiftest action on various fronts of the cold and semihot war. Let Mr. Dulles state directly to Mr. Khrushchev that if he really wants to undo Stalin's betrayal, which he surely must if the world is to believe in the sincerity of his exposure of Stalin, then permit the satellite peoples of Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Poland, Albania, and East Germany to freely elect their own governments and to further give us the entire history and the whole truth about the phony confessions of the Moscow trials of the 1930's.

But beyond these matters, Mr. Speaker, I stress today Stalin's guilt in ordering the Katyn massacre of the Polish officers, and also, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Secretary of State invite Mr. Khrushchev to admit Stalin's and Beria's guilt in the massacre of 15,000 brave Polish officers during the war, of whom

more than 4,000 were found in the mass graves of Katyn, a guilt established beyond the shadow of any doubt by the great investigation undertaken by the select committee of this House, of which I have the honor to be a member.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this day of May 3, 165 years ago, saw the consummation of a constitution that laid firm foundations for the democratic development of Poland. The ideals embodied in this constitution had been centuries in the making. Here are some of the early historical events in which it had its foundations.

The royal charter of Piotrkow in 1496 recognized legislative assemblies of countries as representing the will of the people. Within a few years the national chamber of deputies was formed to carry out this principle. In 1505 under the royal charter, another milestone was achieved by granting that nothing new may be decided without the joint consent of the members of the council and country deputies. In 1573 the kingdom became an elective monarchy, the king being elected by the council or senate with the consent of the gentry.

Those orderly processes culminated in the truly democratic constitution of May 3, 1791. But Poland also faced many struggles before its people realized their desire for a true voice in government. Poland's love for the right of individual liberty made it an integral part of Europe. It was to be the bastion not only of individual liberties but also the bastion of freedom for the rest of Europe.

Time and time again the Poles stopped those who would overrun Europe. In 1241 under Henry II the Poles stemmed the onslaught of the Tartars under Batu Khan who attempted to overrun Europe. In 1620 and 1621 they halted the Turkish armies of invasion which were trying to conquer Europe. Later in 1674 the Poles, under the leadership of King John III Sobieski, at Vienna completely broke the backbone of the Turkish army.

There are many other instances of the Poles being the bulwark in Europe against invasion from the East. These I shall not enumerate, but do want to mention one which I think is of particular importance.

Following World War I, in 1920, the Bolshevik hordes attempted to impress an unwanted type of government upon Poland. The Poles, with complete disregard for life, holding to their undying faith and love of liberty, turned an expected defeat into victory. On August 16 on the Vistula River, they routed the Russian Army. This is known as the Miracle of the Vistula.

This date, I believe, should be commemorated because it marks a very important step in modern history. It shows that if it is the will of the people, the Communist advances can be stopped.

The important thing I want to emphasize today is that without a Poland that

is free and self-governed there will never be peace in Europe. Of course, this also applies to the other nations behind the Iron Curtain.

As you can very well see, the above extremely brief history of Poland pinpoints the necessity of Poland being established again as a free nation, for it always has been and will be opposed to ideologies that covet not only the rest of Europe but the whole world. When and if we in America can accept that and do away with the negative thinking of some people, we then should take a bold stand to bring about peace in the world by positive action and attempt the liberation of the people behind the Iron Curtain.

I believe the Geneva Conference is close enough to the minds of all of us to show that there is no dealing with Communist Russia that is to our advantage. We have constantly come out with the short end. Our dealings should be with the hope of gaining and not constantly regressing.

Here we are today commemorating Polish Constitution Day without giving any assurances to those people as to when and how they will be liberated. It is certainly a sad occasion for us to mark such an event when we really cannot project any real hope that these people will again see the sun for the dark clouds that overshadow Poland.

Mr. Speaker, I just hope and pray that we will see the day when we as a nation of which I am very proud to be a citizen can interpret the laws of God and man and use our just reasoning to bring about the release from enslavement of this gallant nation and defender of liberties, so that its people can join in a true celebration of this day.

THE ENSLAVEMENT OF THE POLISH PEOPLE

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate on the occasion of the celebration of Polish Constitution Day that the American people reiterate their condemnation of the ruthless enslavement of Poland by the Communists. It is also the time to assure the Polish people that we will never acquiesce to their permanent bondage.

The Communist control of Poland is a tragic example of the Soviet practice of violating international agreements. At Yalta the Soviets agreed that free elections would be held as the first step in establishing a democratic Poland. However, ensuing events proved, that the Communists had no intention of abiding by this promise.

The fraudulent elections held after the war placed Polish puppets in control of the government. All democratic elements which existed in Poland were quickly eliminated; and in typical Soviet fashion a policy aimed at the elimination of all vestiges of Polish nationalism was launched to insure complete Red control.

Today, Poland lives under a regime which attempts to control both the mind and body of the Polish people. The Communists find that constant force is necessary to keep the Poles under submission. Conscious that the Polish people are deeply religious the Reds initially concentrated their attack on the church. Religious persecution was followed by agricultural collectivization and forced labor, serving the dual purpose of eliminating resistance and bolstering the economy of the totalitarian state.

Although they have lost their freedom, the Polish people have never lost hope for the restoration of their liberty. Communism will always be abhorred by the Poles for it contradicts the basic character of Polish society which traditionally has been based on liberty and justice. Unfortunately, they cannot openly demand their freedom. Secretly, however, and with the aid of Polish people in exile they are incessantly working for the restoration of their freedom.

It is the moral responsibility of the United States to join with the Polish people and all Polish patriotic groups in denouncing Polish enslavement. The American people have never accepted the permanency of Satellite Poland. They are aware that the present regime in Poland is unconstitutional and continues to exist by force alone. They are also cognizant that the security of the free world is constantly in jeopardy as long as Poland is enslaved.

Especially, on this anniversary of Polish Constitution Day, the American people wish to assure the enslaved Poles that the United States has always recognized the right of any people to choose their own system of government; that we will never be a part of any agreement continuing the subjugation of Poland; and that we will continue to support Poland in her struggle to be free.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 165th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, that memorable milestone in the evolution of democracy in Europe.

It is fitting, therefore, that we pause in our deliberations and pay tribute to the courageous Polish nation, whose devotion to the principles of democracy and liberty is firmly inscribed upon the pages of history.

The parliamentary system existed in Poland for centuries prior to the signing of the constitution of May 3. In fact the Poles have been called a nation of Parliaments, because of their traditional allegiance to the principle that the legality of a given measure requires the freely expressed agreement of all interested parties, and because of their adherence to their parliamentary institutions throughout all the centuries of their independent existence.

The Constitution of May 3 was a natural product of this distinguished tradition, and represented a historic

milestone in the development of democratic processes both in Poland and in Europe in general. This document eliminated the fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system of the 18th century, and provided a series of basic elements which have retained a lasting value for the Polish nation to this very day. It also served as a source of inspiration not only to the Poles, but to freedom-loving peoples of all democratic countries.

As we pay tribute to this remarkable document, our thoughts turn to the present plight of the Polish people and we may wonder why a nation which has contributed so much over the centuries to the cause of Christianity and democracy, has been made to suffer so terribly under the yoke of Communist domination.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not dwell on the suffering of the Polish people under the rule of the brutal regime imposed upon them by the Kremlin, because these facts are well known to all of us. Instead, I believe that we ought to restate our determination to further the cause of freedom and self-determination for all of the captive and subjugated peoples. To this end, we must rededicate our most earnest efforts.

It is my hope, shared by millions of Americans of Polish ancestry, that the spirit of the Constitution of May 3 shall continue to live in the hearts of the Polish nation, and hasten the day when the principles embodied in that document shall once again be proclaimed openly and freely throughout the Polish land.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, today is an important day in the lives of the Polish people, and I wish to add my congratulations and express my sincere desire to assist in achieving their complete independence. Today, Poland exists in name only in the hearts and spirit of the Polish people. On this May 3, 1956, when freedom-loving Poles celebrate their national holiday and the anniversary of their constitution, they should be given the encouragement and the reassurance that lies in the simple fact that we have not forgotten them.

Forget? How can any American forget the memory of the gallant Gen. Casimir Pulaski who so bravely aided our people to win their independence in a past generation. General Pulaski came from his native Poland to offer, without reservation, his assistance and his fortune in developing the cavalry for the Army of George Washington. He was fighting not for personal advantage or gain but rather for the principles and ideals to which he was dedicated. In battle, General Pulaski's devotion to the great American cause was demonstrated by his gallant charge into the enemy lines, and his tragic death has served to ennoble him in the eyes of the entire liberty-loving world.

General Pulaski was one of the many Poles that aided the course of democracy in America. History books are replete with the names and heroic exploits of other Poles, dating from the founding of our country to World War II when the Polish Government in exile was formed in Paris in October 1939, with two other outstanding and courageous Poles in the forefront, Wladyslaw Raczewicz as President of the Republic, and Wladyslaw Sikorski as Prime Minister and commander in chief of the Armed Forces.

All nations except the U. S. S. R. and the Axis Powers promptly recognized this Government as Poland's only legal governing body. An Army, Navy, and Air Force were recreated in France, and the fight of underground resistance was carried on in the homeland.

When the Red army crossed the pre-war Polish-Soviet frontier, in January 1944, in its victorious drive against the Nazis, the Poles had to make a serious decision: What should be the attitude of the underground?

After much discussion among leaders in London and in Poland, it was decided that the home army should fight the Germans to the end and should help the Red army wherever it could. This left the underground open to all kinds of suicidal missions ordered by the Russians. In many cases the Red commanders actually conspired with the Germans in an attempt to destroy the underground, the power they knew would be their opposition when they decided to walk into Poland. In 1947, the new exclusively Communist Government started a mass liquidation of democratic elements.

The following factors are evident in the life of Poland today. Polish people live under a totalitarian regime which enslaves not only their bodies, but also tries to enslave their minds. The Communist Government presents probably the most integrated totalitarian system ever known. The terror, the scope of physical extermination of actual or potential opponents, and the amount of people arrested and deported far exceed any totalitarian forms of the past.

My highest esteem and commendation go out to these brave men, along with those members of the clergy, who sacrificed their lives to reunite a Poland which has been partitioned for many centuries.

America has always befriended the small nations of the world. To Poland we owe a lasting debt of gratitude. First because it is the land of our earliest benefactors, and secondly, because it was this brave little country that first accepted the challenge of Hitler.

Is Poland to go unrewarded? Shall her government be forever the puppet of a stronger nation whose godless philosophy is repugnant to the Christian beliefs of the Polish people? Certainly not. We cannot follow the happenings in Poland today without coming to the very definite realization that Russia is violently impressing her will on these people. During the last war the Soviet Union with diabolical calculation set out to diminish and destroy all sources of Polish democratic leadership, in fear that these free principles might, in the

postwar era, frustrate Communist objectives in making Poland a satellite state.

The Polish people oppose the Communists and their doctrines at every turn and in every way they can. Such opposition is certainly to be encouraged and the people supported in their efforts to be free. The Poles cannot object in any organized way on a national level, but they can be given the comfort and encouragement of the free world. The Polish Americans of our great country are their greatest source of encouragement and by their example may do much eventually to assist them in their quest for liberation.

A free and independent Poland is needed now, just as this was recognized by former President Woodrow Wilson when he made it part of his famous 14-point program. Our present Government recognizes this fact and should do everything it can to achieve that goal. The warm friendship of the Polish people for Americans is evident and this mutual admiration is the strongest link in the chain of freedom that will someday replace the yoke of communism.

With my many friends of Polish ancestry I join in paying tribute to a great nation whose liberties, with God's help, shall be renewed and sustained.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I call the attention of the House to the fact that today marks the anniversary of Polish Constitution Day. Due to the fact that I have large numbers of citizens of Polish background within my congressional district and even greater numbers within my own State of Michigan, matters dealing with the question of Poland are always very close to me. I am also in a position to sympathize with the present plight of the Polish people since my own 2 years of residence behind the Iron Curtain gave me a good picture of the sufferings they have undergone and are still enduring under Communist slavery.

Every since my return from Communist-occupied Europe and especially since my entry into Congress, I have always lent the best of my own efforts toward advancing the cause of freedom for the enslaved peoples. It is a wonderful feeling to know that our present administration shares those sentiments. President Eisenhower and our State Department have stated time and again that the peaceful liberation of the captive peoples is and remains a cornerstone of our foreign policy. Secretary of State Dulles himself has said many times that this Government will make no bargain or deal with the Soviets which would in any sense tend to confirm the slavery of the peoples now living under Red tyranny. What a difference in our Government's thinking and attitude since the days of the shameful sellout of Poland at Yalta.

Many changes appear to be taking place within the Soviet Union. We who know the true nature of Red communism recognize that these are merely changes in tactics without any abandonment of basic Communist strategy and aims of world domination. But it is possible that these changes will weaken the Soviet internal structure to such an extent that other developments, not now apparent, may emerge, developments which may affect not only the Soviet people but those of the satellite nations as well.

I feel sure that there must be a revival of hope for freedom among the captive peoples because of this fact that the Kremlin tyrants appear to be falling out with one another and seem to find it necessary to blame all the evils of the past upon the dead Stalin. At this time, therefore, it is particularly important that we of the Congress, representing millions of free Americans, take this opportunity to send words of friendship and encouragement to the Polish people and to all others now in slavery behind the Iron Curtain. Let this observance of Polish Constitution Day be another occasion to reassure them that the Government and people of the United States are dedicated to their peaceful liberation from totalitarian bondage. And let us all hope and pray that that time will come soon.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join with my many colleagues today in marking Polish Constitution Day. It is a day that is commemorated by the great Polish American organizations of this country. It is fitting that we here in this Congress rise and proclaim our respect for and our admiration of the heroic Polish people. From this forum on this day tributes are paid by the spokesmen of a free, democratic people to the millions of Polish patriots that live today under the yoke of the hammer and sickle of the Communist-dominated government of Poland.

Mr. Speaker, it is no great wonder that George Washington, our own first President, acclaimed the great Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, and in ringing words praised the Polish King, Stanislaw II, for his enlightened leadership. In France, England, and other parts of the western world, many voices were heard in common praise of the peaceful "Polish revolution." Peace, orderliness, and conciliation marked the transformation of the Polish Government from the old to the new. Some of the reforms brought into being by the new constitution were radical; however, they were carried out without violence, terror, or civil disorder of any kind. When the Polish Diet accepted the new constitution, all Poland rejoiced.

We ourselves have much to be grateful for in the accomplishments of the Polish people, for many of the sons and daughters of those pioneers in democracy came to settle in our own country where they

have made a contribution that is beyond measurement. The history of the Poles in our own country is a story of which the Polish people can well be proud. During the years from the end of the Civil War to the close of World War I, the number of Polish Americans and their influence was on the increase. Adjusting their own precious heritage to the great opportunities of their new environment, they brought into existence the Polish-American community. After World War I, the native-born generation of Americans of Polish parentage were increasingly active in the life of the community and of the country. Retaining their consciousness of their Polish ancestry yet identifying themselves with American society, they became more and more articulate in literature, music, scholarship, and art. In the world of music we have but to recall such names as Ignace Paderewski, Josef Hoffman, Arthur Rubinstein, and Leopold Stokowski to realize the great debt we owe to the rich culture of Poland.

Polish Americans have likewise contributed greatly to the spiritual strength and the religious growth of our country. Also a considerable group have come as political refugees. General Thaddeus Kosciuszko, who won great distinction for himself in America, was one of these. All during the 19th century, but particularly after the Civil War, the partitions of Poland, coupled with hope of a better living led many thousands of Poles to flock to America's shores. Consequently they not only constitute the largest Slavic group in the United States; they outnumber all the other Slavic groups taken together.

These people have given their hands and their hearts to the service of America; they have helped to build our civilization and culture. Now, however, when they look across the sea to the home of their forebears, they see a nation enslaved by a foreign power. They know something of the oppression and misery which exists there. They also know that tyranny is a degenerate force which will finally be consumed by its own evil and die. Neither they nor we will accept the awful conditions of these unfortunate people. We pray that for this land where human freedom was so proudly proclaimed almost 200 years ago, the day of liberation is not far off.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Polish Constitution of 1791 was directed to a government like that of our own—of, by, and for the people, and it marked an important strike in world history toward the democratic freedoms which we most fervently hope will ultimately prevail everywhere.

Today is another observance of Poland's Constitution Day and I join my colleagues in looking forward to the day when Poland shall again be free from the bonds of tyranny and be numbered among the free nations of the world.

We, in America, have great sympathy for all people under the oppression of Communist forces, and today we are thinking particularly of Poland. Her citizens have suffered much in the cause of liberty and justice. They have struggled and are continuing to this day their utmost efforts against the chains of communism.

We send our greetings to the people of Poland and our earnest prayers are that the forces of totalitarianism will eventually be overthrown.

THE GENEVA CONFERENCE AND THE FUTURE OF POLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker today is Polish Constitution Day. This is a day when all Americans turn their thoughts to our ally and proven friend, the Polish Nation, which is now enslaved by the Russian Communist—a day when we particularly remind ourselves of the great contribution made by the patriotic sons of Poland during the Revolutionary War. Today we recall the continuing contribution to our growth and development made by millions of Americans of Polish descent whose forebears came to our shores after our struggle for national independence was won.

But this Polish Constitution Day has added significance in 1956. I say this because of the extraordinary effort being made by the Russian tyrants to convince the world that they, the Russians, believe in a policy of peace, a policy of live and let live, a policy of coexistence. This extraordinary effort being made by the Kremlin has, in my judgment, one major purpose. That purpose is to cause the free world to forget the many crimes by the Russian Communists against nations and people which, if fully recorded and adequately reported to the people of the world, would cause such a revulsion as to cause communism to pass swiftly from the affairs of men. The Russians know well that if they can cause free people to be deluded into believing there is truth and sincerity behind their present propaganda campaign, the still free nations will sooner or later drop their guard and unwittingly accord recognition to the vastly expanded Russian Communist empire. The Russians are already advancing the idea of the United States accepting things as they are as a settlement of outstanding differences. This includes the enslavement of Poland.

And so the future of Poland, from the practical point of view, depends in very large part upon how the Government of the United States officially reacts to the present offers of the Russian Communists for a status quo between the forces of freedom and the forces of human slavery as represented by international communism. This, in my judgment, is the world crisis created by the so-called conferences at the summit in Geneva, the political and propaganda offensives unleashed by the so-called 20th Congress meeting of the Communist Party which

was held in Moscow during February of this year, and the subversive efforts of the Russia-first movement in the United States during the past years. All these events and forces spell bad tidings for the future for our beloved ally, Poland, and all the other non-Russian nations enslaved by the conspiracy of communism.

It is interesting to note that against this background which I have cited, the Russian rump regime which now controls Poland, has launched a number of unusual pronouncements in order to demonstrate what good parrots they are of the Kremlin tyrants. A short time ago, the quisling regime in Poland announced that a general amnesty was to be granted to all Poles abroad if they would return to their native land. The conditions of this amnesty were that such persons, upon returning to their native land of Poland, would admit publicly that they had been misled by what the Russians call the propaganda of the West, and that their only loyalty in the future would be to the Russian quislings who now control the affairs of the Polish people.

Shortly after the so-called general amnesty was announced, the Russian rump regime in Warsaw made the startling public confession that the veterans of the Polish home army had been discriminated against and had been subjected to certain injustices. This amazing statement was accompanied by a statement that the Russian stooges in Warsaw were anxious to correct the many injustices and discriminations against the veterans of the Polish home army. What a hollow promise this must be to the surviving relatives of those grand patriots of the Polish home army, who fought to the bitter end against the vicious Nazi army which the Russian army stood idly by only a few miles away across the Vistula River and drank Russian vodka in a demonic toast to the destruction of much of the leadership and the patriotic army of our proven ally, the Polish nation. What a ghastly confession this must be to those gallant members of the Polish home army who survived the siege of Warsaw, who later carried on the patriotic struggle against the predatory Russian occupiers and who, under another phony Russian amnesty, put down their arms and were then sentenced to a living death in the barren wastes of Russian Siberia. What a revolting echo this must set up in the halls of freedom throughout the world where Polish patriots gather to plan, to hope, and to pray for the liberation of their beloved Poland, and the restoration of her national independence.

But all of these signs, as evil as they may be, carry some good tidings for the universal cause of freedom, and in particular, for the cause of our beloved ally, Poland. As I see it, the latest shifts, dodges, and admissions of the Russian tyrants have been brought about by the tremendous internal pressure created by the force of nationalism which is the greatest force at work within the entire Russian empire. Secondly, I see in the rising tide of nationalism, a growing

and powerful force against the new Russian colonial system which demands unlimited idolatry and worship of the "big brother" Russian, who in fact, is no brother at all. I speak of the growing nationalism in the non-Russian nations enslaved by the Kremlin.

There are many signs which seem to indicate that even the Polish quislings, who once believed that Russian communism would occupy and colonize the whole world, are now beset by doubts and severe misgivings about their former Russian love. There are also signs that the upswing of the indomitable Polish love of their own culture, their own folklore, their own traditions, and their own brand of patriotism is developing a political force which defies Russification and signals the beginning of the end of the Russian occupation of Poland.

While the sky of international affairs is overcast and ominous, there are some signs that the sun will soon rise again over Poland to give new warmth, strength, and vitality to the demands of the good Polish people for a return of the way of life which has been Poland down through the centuries and which has contributed so much to man's endless search and struggle for a world at peace in which all men will be certain of justice and equality.

All of this brings me back to the question of what the Government of the United States shall do in the face of the new propaganda offensive launched by the leaders in the Moscow Kremlin. All thinking people await the answer to this question. Will the administration accept the proposal of the Russians for coexistence, with all the false attractions of trade and lush profits which were dangled before the British last week and which are now being discussed in Washington cocktail circles today? Or on the other hand, will the present administration demonstrate a sense of conscience and be mindful of the high moral proposals enunciated by President Eisenhower during his presidential campaign of 1952 in which he promised, without reservation, the complete dedication of the Government he hoped to head, to a policy of liberating Poland and all the other captive nations from a slavery unequaled in the evil side of the ledger books of history? This is the fundamental question which the present administration must face up to. The answer to this question may very well determine the kind of life you and I live, as well as the kind of life our children, our grandchildren, and their children's children will be compelled to live. This is the fundamental question which we, as good Americans on this Polish Constitution Day must ask ourselves. The answer is clear to you and to me. I fervently hope that the present administration will, with confidence and fortitude, pursue the only way open to a preservation of those great human values which patriots down through history have called individual liberty, human freedom, representative government, and the right of all people to self-determination.

Poland, by right, ought to be free. Poland must be free and independent; that is the hope and prayer of all Americans on this Polish Constitution Day.

**POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY, 1956:
A TRIBUTE TO THE POLISH PEOPLE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as an American of Polish descent, it is a distinct privilege to have the opportunity of joining with my colleagues in paying tribute to the Polish people on this auspicious occasion—the commemoration of the 165th anniversary of the Polish constitution.

The Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, is a document worthy of praise. Its adoption by the Polish Diet—Parliament—was accepted by a joyful citizenry for they knew it was to bring forth a new era of liberty and protection, regardless of one's station in life. Gladstone, the distinguished British Prime Minister, once described our own Constitution as "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." Because of its many reforms for the betterment of the people, and the perseverance of its framers, I am sure that Gladstone's remark could be extended with justice to the Polish Constitution of 1791.

It is most fitting that we pause in our regular routine to honor a brave nation and a courageous people on this, their national holiday. The Polish people have contributed much to the development and growth of the United States, and we would be shirking our duty and traditional principles if we did not offer them encouragement and support during their present plight under the oppressive rule of communism.

The history of Poland is well known. It has suffered much humiliation and depredation by the hands of alien powers whose rulers sought only to keep Poland weak and helpless. In the past, Poland and her people have demonstrated their strong will power in fighting for the liberties and rights which we in the free world cherish so much. Knowing that Poland has produced such men of determination as Pulaski, Kosciuszko, and Paderewski, I am confident that Poland will again become free, that its people will once again be able to practice the inalienable rights in which all men have been endowed as creatures of God.

We are all aware of the conditions in Poland today. The government is not that of the people but dictatorial. The people are not allowed to pursue their religious conscience nor assert their views for fear of punishment. Since the Communists have taken control of Poland, they have intensified their efforts to indoctrinate the people with Communist ideology, but time and again the Poles have fought back, whatever the odds. The Soviets have exploited the economic wealth of Poland and have shipped needed Polish supplies and materials to Russia. To climax these extraordinary cruelties, the Communists have sought to black out from the minds of the people their rich and glorious history. We know from Poland's past that despite these tactics, her people will never despair, nor admit defeat.

Today, on this historical occasion, we are afforded the opportunity of offering encouragement to the Polish people and to repeat that we are not resigned to their present fate under communistic rule. Poland looks to the United States for leadership and we must not fail her.

Today we reaffirm our pledge to the Polish people and other peoples suffering the same oppressive rule that we do not condone the enslavement of once free and democratic nations and that we support them in their aspirations in self-determination.

It is our fervent hope that the Polish and other captive peoples of Europe will soon be able to enjoy the governments of their own choice and again worship in the church of their choice, without fear.

We pray that God will soon grant these objectives, so that freedom-loving and God-fearing people can live in peace throughout the world.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my voice to the others here today in commemoration of Polish Constitution Day, an occasion to be remembered by the Polish people much the same as we Americans would remember the date of the signing of our Declaration of Independence. And indeed the Polish Constitution adopted on May 3, 1791 was very much like the Constitution of the United States, for it embodied the same principles of liberty and democracy.

But although the Polish people will celebrate this day with pride, they will also be filled with sorrow at the dilemma in which they find themselves today. For the freedom which they enjoyed and the principles which they have always cherished have been crushed by the tyranny of Communist aggression, despite all the valiant efforts of the Polish people to regain their liberty. This sorrow is shared by all freedom-loving people and we here in America extend our hopes and our absolute belief that the courage that has characterized the Polish people and the traditional spirit of determination will again bring them through and restore them to their rightful place among the family of nations.

This is not the first time that the Polish people have seen days of darkness. For their country was devastated during the First World War when armies crossed and recrossed the land of Poland, and then after only a few years of sovereignty, their land was again ravished by a totalitarian aggressor. We salute them for their bravery in these years and for the independent spirit that still prevails today in this unhappy land, and we hope that their will to continue resistance to aggression may be strengthened by the words of friendship and encouragement from their allies here in the United States.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, this week throughout the United States celebrations are being staged commemorating the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of 1791. However, these commemorations point up more the birth of a constitution; they also reiterate and reaffirm faith in democracy and social justice. The national Polish patriots who proclaimed this new constitution were precursors of a liberal tradition that heralded the beginning of the present democratic era. These patriots were among the first Europeans to capture the essence of democratic idealism, liberating the dynamic forces of a new ideology. The 1791 constitution should therefore be judged not by today's standards, but against the background of medieval obscurantism. Only in that way may we of the mid-20th century appreciate the real significance of May 3.

Geographically isolated for centuries in Eastern Europe, Poland long struggled against the depredations of foreigners and the stultifying pressures of invading hordes. Dismemberment and partition were historically her most common fate. Foreign powers ruthlessly competed with one another upon Polish soil, ignoring the inner longings and internal integrity of the Polish people. Nevertheless, the physical dismemberment of her land never successfully suppressed the national vitality of Poland, and her indomitable spirit and will to survive persisted over the intervening years. In the late 18th century, when the French revolutionary standard of "liberty, equality, and fraternity" caught the imagination of progressives everywhere, an intellectual elite within Poland took advantage of the relaxed international situation and the spirit of the times by promulgating the constitution of May 3, 1791.

The 1791 Constitution of Poland was the result of a compromise between progressive trends of the day and existing adverse conditions. Externally the competing nationalisms of Russia and Austria were diverted into war against Turkey, and Prussia felt a momentary friendly disposition for Polish national aspirations. Internally the effective political groups were divided on national policies, but the persisting desire for external freedom and independence finally swept aside protestations of reactionary nobles. The wishes of the patriots prevailed and the enlightened principles of justice, equality, and freedom were embodied in a new constitution.

This document, one of the first written constitutions in modern Europe, was a political milestone. It meant the triumph of democracy over the illiberal tendencies of absolutism. For example, one part of it declared:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale, and a lasting foundation.

Its main features included the following points: First, the establishment of a limited monarchy with definite ministerial responsibility; second, the granting of autonomy to the towns; third, the enlargement of electoral privileges; fourth, the extension of numerous privileges to lower classes; fifth, the restoration of certain peasant rights; sixth, the inclusion of peasants under the protection of the law; seventh, the guarantee of freedom of conscience; and eighth, the establishment of religious toleration.

As a forerunner of liberal constitutions, the 1791 constitution of Poland is a hallmark in constitutional government. For the first time the Poles explicitly expressed their great beliefs of national liberty, preserving them for posterity within the framework of a legal document. Outside of Poland the importance of this democratic instrument also was recognized. Edmund Burke, of England, declared that "humanity must rejoice and glory when it considers the change in Poland." George Washington said:

Poland, by the public papers, appears to have made large and unexpected strides toward liberty.

Enunciating this ideal of raising Poland from humiliation to a position of security, however, did not mark the culmination of the long political battle. Polish reactionaries immediately denounced the constitution, fearing it might spread the "contagion of democratic ideals." And shortly thereafter outside powers partitioned Poland again and the constitution was never put into effect.

For 165 years the ideals of the 1791 constitution persisted, and it stood as a permanent source of hope to freedom-loving Poles everywhere. Finally the goals of independence and freedom that the Poles had continued to nourish were espoused by Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States. He saw to it that Polish aspirations for nationhood were included within his 14 points for post-World War I peace objectives. The rebirth of Poland in 1918 was a stubborn reaffirmation of Polish national vitality and unrelenting liberalism. For 20 years Poland pursued her own course of independence, strengthening her social structure, and adding immeasurably to the common cause of democracy.

Tragedy struck Poland again during World War II. Eventually she was conquered by Russia and submitted to sovietization of her people and territory. Nevertheless the Soviet policy of communization has not smothered her pride or will, because the ideological principle of democracy had long before taken firm root. Poland's real tragedy over the years is that her resources and strength have been subverted to the purposes of alien people. However, in the end Poland will return to the comity of nations as a free power. Polish people are deeply steeped in the traditions leading toward social and political justice, with the May 3 constitution representing the finest elements of that tradition.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, 165 years ago today—just a year and a half after the ratification of the Constitution of the United States—the freedom-loving Polish people adopted a constitution of their own. The Americans and the Poles at that time had many things in common. Both had been oppressed. Both yearned for freedom and both recognized that no state can be permitted to exert total power over its citizens.

Our Founding Fathers declared that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. The constitution of the Polish people, adopted in 1791, expressly recognized that "all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people."

The bonds of that spiritual and philosophical accord had been woven during our own War of Independence. Every schoolboy is familiar with the story of that great Pole, the youthful Gen. Kazimierz Pulaski, who gave his life for our liberty after coming to America at his own expense with the purpose of serving our cause, to which he was dedicated.

As tragedies frequently inspire men to great deeds, so the tragic history of the Polish people has been an inspiration to them and should be to us.

Never has their hard-won freedom been lasting. Within a year after the adoption of the constitution of 1791 they were again partitioned. For more than a century and a quarter thereafter the Polish people—without any semblance of a Polish state—continued their zealous and courageous fight to regain their independence.

Finally, at the conclusion of World War I, their independence was again formally proclaimed, and the following year Ignace Paderewski, the renowned patriot and pianist, became their first premier. Hardly another year had passed before the Russians invaded Poland, and another tragedy seemed inevitable. But with a faith that has rarely been equaled in modern warfare, the Poles stood up to the invader and hurled him back, thereby preserving for a time their well-merited independence.

The horrors of World War II and the aftermath putting this gallant people under the heel of the Red Soviet dictatorship need not be detailed now. Anyone with faith in the ultimate overcoming of evil by good will know that this is not the end of Polish liberty and independence. A people who have been physically subjugated time after time, only to rise again to attain their freedom, are not to be given up by us as lost. True it is that the savagery of the Soviet domination undoubtedly surpasses all previous experience. But that serves only as an added incentive to the oppressed people to regain their status among the nations of the world to which they are entitled.

We in the United States through the operations of the Displaced Persons Act and the Refugee Relief Act, and in other ways, have proffered our hand to assist many of the Polish people. We are, perhaps, not now in a position to demon-

strate in more concrete fashion our feeling of faith in their cause. However, we can let them know that we hope and pray, with confidence, that their present plight will somehow be brought to an end and that they will achieve again the liberty and independence that has been wrung from them so that the names of Poles will again be recorded in history among the world's great in patriotism, the arts and sciences, and in human dignity.

SMALL BUSINESS TENANTS BEING DISPOSSESSED UNDER REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM IN OUR URBAN CENTERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under the redevelopment program in our urban centers small-business tenants are being dispossessed and forced to move from communities in which they have been long established. There is nothing in existing law to authorize the advance to them of funds for moving expenses or to recompense them for money that they have expended in moving their stocks and fixtures from old to new locations.

The bill that I have introduced, H. R. 9351, provides for such payment of moving expense and also for loans to these dispossessed small-business tenants for the reestablishment of their businesses in new locations.

This conforms with a policy established by Congress in section 401 (V) of the act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 624), which authorized the military departments to make payments for moving expenses in the case of their public-works projects. The Act of July 14, 1952, covers the moving expenses which are the result of land acquisitions.

The departments had numerous inquiries as to why it had not reimbursed landowners and tenants for moving expenses when acquiring lands. The answer necessarily had to be that it had no authority to do so. The act of July 14, 1952, gave it the authority to make such payments for moving expenses with the one provision that in no case should the amount exceed 25 percent of the value of the acquired land.

On March 19, 1956, the House recognized the equity of reimbursing landowners and tenants for expenses and other losses necessitated when lands are acquired for water and power development by passing H. R. 5975. Without this legislation it is not within the purview of the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse owners and tenants for such expenses. Expenses of the types covered by H. R. 5975 are not within the purview of the appraisal process when lands are acquired or within the purview of judicial determination under the condemnation statutes.

The passage of this bill was recommended by the Honorable Fred G. Aandahl, Assistant Secretary of the Interior. He said:

We recommend that this bill be enacted. We also recommend that consideration be given to enlarging its scope. H. R. 5975

would authorize reimbursement of land-owners and tenants for expenses, loss or damage incurred in moving themselves, their immediate families and their property from lands acquired on projects under the Federal reclamation laws.

I wish to thank the distinguished and very able chairman of the subcommittee of the Small Business Committee, Congressman MULTER, and the members of his subcommittee for scheduling a public hearing at which constituents of mine were given an opportunity fully to picture the situation that exists in Chicago among small-business tenants and of the urgent need for legislation for their relief on the pattern and in accord with the policies set forth in the act of July 14, 1952, and which we in the House followed in the passage by unanimous vote of H. R. 5975.

Among the witnesses from Chicago who testified at the public hearing of Chairman MULTER's subcommittee today were Ira J. Bach, executive director of the Chicago Land Clearance Commission; Julian H. Levi, executive director of the Southeast Chicago Commission; Hon. Leon M. Despres, alderman of the Hyde Park ward in Chicago; Walker Sandbach, of the Hyde Park Business & Professional Association; and Bruce Sagan, publisher of the Hyde Park Herald.

I earnestly recommend to all my colleagues the careful reading of the testimony of these witnesses who are closest to this very acute situation in our large cities.

Statement of Julian Levi, executive director of the Southeast Chicago Commission:

My name is Julian Levi. I am executive director of the Southeast Chicago Commission and appear on its behalf as authorized by its executive committee.

The Southeast Chicago Commission is a citizens' organization interested in the conservation and improvement of the communities within the southeast area of the city of Chicago, from the north at 39th Street, to the south at 67th Street, to the west at Cottage Grove, and to the east at the lake. The commission was organized by six of the major community organizations within that area, working with the University of Chicago. At this time there is not only full participation and interest in the work of the commission through the great mass of citizens within that area but, in addition, these citizens—approximately 2,000 of them—help raise the commission's yearly budget and actively participate in its programs.

The particular problem which is before you this morning is directed to the experiences which are encountered by businessmen within urban-renewal areas. It is, of course, not unique for businesses to be dispossessed and damaged as a result of public-improvement programs. Every highway, every road-widening program—does exactly that to some business people. Mere community change also achieves the same result. Physical obsolescence accomplishes this injury almost as much.

It may be borne in mind, for instance, that the area on 55th Street in Chicago with which we are immediately concerned consists largely of buildings erected at the time of the first World's Fair before the turn of the century. The amount of floor space available for merchandising, the amount of floor load possible, the capacity of plumbing and wiring, all were directed to an earlier era when food came in barrels rather than in cans, when quick-frozen foods were not even thought of, and where the maid whose

services are now built into the picked, cleaned and washed spinach neatly packed in a frozen food package was actually at work in the kitchen of the customer. So, in one sense perhaps it was only a question of time until the situation would have become so obsolete and old that business people of substance of their own accord would have deserted the area. If, however, we were to have waited to that point, we would have become involved in a total slum clearance project of tremendous proportions.

The very point of urban renewal is to attempt to reverse the process prior to the time that the entire community lies prostrate. And in these circumstances it must be recognized that great hardship and injury may be done to the individual business establishment.

The loss is just as widespread as if a tornado were to have devastated a half mile of street. We acknowledge with great appreciation the fact that despite this, it has been the universal view of the business people in our community that the program ought to proceed. But we do not feel that full justice can be done unless arrangements, such as those suggested in Congressman O'HARA's legislation, become available. There is in fact an even further injustice in the solicitude that is shown to an individual tenant or family for whom a wealth of relocation services are made available while the business establishment whose existence represents many, many years of hard work and effort, and whose continuance means not the inconvenience of a dwelling unit lost but the greater hardship of income loss, goes forgotten.

We recognize that a program of relief is needed and we desire to support it.

We believe, moreover, that in order to insure the full measure of public support required for carrying out urban renewal programs over the country that these inequities should be met and corrected.

Statement of Hon. Leon M. Despres, alderman of the fifth ward of Chicago:

My name is Leon M. Despres. I live at 1220 East 56th Street. I am alderman of the fifth ward of Chicago, which includes the redevelopment project known as Hyde Park A. In redevelopment project Hyde Park A, approximately 10 linear blocks of commercial property will be torn down. More than a hundred small retail enterprises are being forced to give up their locations. Although some of these establishments can be terminated or moved without fatal damage to the owners, some of them are establishments which have been in the neighborhood for many, many years. For many of the small retail merchants who are lessees of their stores, the redevelopment means destruction of their business.

I am appearing here today in their behalf to ask you to make some provision now for their very serious and urgent situation. Their situation is urgent because, as condemnation progresses, they are being forced to move. Similar problems are likely to arise in every redevelopment project which affects business property.

You have already made provision to pay the moving expenses of residential tenants. This means that a transient resident who has moved into the area will receive moving expenses, but the retail merchants who have been in the area for years, receive nothing.

Under our condemnation laws, and under the condemnation laws of nearly all States, the retail tenant generally receives no compensation whatsoever.

Most small retail tenants operate on short-term leases. Moreover, since redevelopment has been in the air in Hyde Park for more than 3 years, most of the leases of these enterprises are either completed or very close to the end of their term. As a result, the merchants are nearly all on very short term or month-to-month leases of their premises.

Very few of them have long-term leases which might afford them a small measure of protection.

Even where the retail tenant has a long-term lease, he cannot recover anything in the condemnation proceeding unless he proves that the rental fixed in his lease is lower than the fair market rental value of the premises; but since such premises are generally rented at fair market rental value, the tenant recovers nothing in condemnation proceedings. There is no allowance for the destruction of the good will. In fact, the law really operates to give a premium to the landlord for the economic value which the merchant tenant has developed. Thus, while the landlords receive the full, fair, cash market value of their real estate as determined by the success of the tenants' enterprise, the tenants, whose businesses are utterly destroyed, receive nothing. They do not even receive moving expenses. They receive no preference in the new shopping center. They receive no aid in obtaining financing for a new location, although equipment financing is either impossible to obtain or terribly expensive on a short-term basis.

It might be argued that these retail tenants could have been displaced at any time by ordinary economic causes or even by the whim of a landlord. Although occasionally a landlord does arbitrarily force a retail tenant to move, that is not generally very good business for a landlord, and economic factors generally operate to cause landlords to keep satisfied retail tenants. The important factor in the redevelopment is that, but for the redevelopment, these retail tenants would all be continuing their enterprises.

I would like to give you three examples.

1. Four years ago, a husband and wife took over a small home bakery store which has been in existence for a great many years. They paid \$16,000 for heavy equipment weighing many tons—an oven, a freezer, a steamer, and other equipment. Although the store has a frontage of only 25 feet, it does a thriving business and is a credit to the community. As redevelopment and demolition progress, business on the street is declining. The lease has 2 years to run. With the ultimate demolition of the building, the bakery business will be wiped out. There will be no compensation paid in the condemnation case for either the unexpired lease or the equipment. The new shopping center will call for a bakery delivery stand and has no place for a home bakery. Under present conditions, the total savings of the bakery couple in the enterprise are wiped out. If they have help in moving expenses and in equipping a new bakery elsewhere, they can relocate successfully.

2. Twenty years ago, a pharmacist bought a small going drug store, which had then been a successful small business for 20 years. I remember buying baby supplies from him for my daughter after he first took over. His present lease runs into next year. Demolition in the neighborhood has reduced his total customers and his sales. He would like to move now but is obligated to pay a rent which is now much higher than market value. Demolition will terminate his business. He can salvage some of his equipment. His huge stock of prescriptions will be valueless. He will have to start all over again in a new location. He needs financial help for moving and reequipment expenses when moving time comes.

3. One of the affected retail merchants operates a retail liquor store which he and his wife started in 1937. By very hard work, he built a small store into an excellent and creditable enterprise. He was so enthusiastic about redevelopment 3 years ago that he was very active in helping to raise money for the citizens' organization which pushed neighborhood redevelopment. Among his delivery customers he values leaders of the community. After 19 years, he is now being

redeveloped completely out of business—good will, freezer equipment, store equipment and all, without any compensation.

I want to be sure to convey a correct impression. The community strongly supports urban redevelopment. But we strongly urge your immediate support of the pending measure as an emergency aid which gives these displaced business tenants, in part at least, the fair treatment they are entitled to have.

Statement of Walker Sandbach, of the Hyde Park Business and Professional Association of Chicago:

My name is Walker Sandbach. I live at 5320 University Avenue, Chicago, Ill. I am a retail-store manager, soon to join the growing ranks of displaced businessmen in our large cities.

I am appearing here on behalf of the Hyde Park Business and Professional Association, a businessmen's group that has been in existence in our community for over 50 years and which today has 210 small business and professional men and women as members throughout the entire Hyde Park area. I am chairman of a new committee which was formed for the first time this year. It is significantly called the redevelopment committee.

Our community is one of the first in the Nation to be redeveloped under the Federal-State-city program for urban renewal. Because this is a pioneering program, the businessmen had no way to know how it would affect them. Our business association strongly supported the program from the beginning, and continues to support it, because, like all good citizens, we want to see our community improved. We gave our support in the belief that those merchants who were forced to relocate would be adequately compensated for moving and other related expenses. It never occurred to us that the Government could force a business tenant to move with no compensation whatsoever if he happened to be a tenant with only a short time left to run on his lease. The owners of property are adequately protected under the law. Household tenants are paid moving expenses, even in the case of transients who move into the community a short time before the property is taken. But there is no protection for the business tenant with a short time left to run on his lease, even if he has been in business in the community for 30 or more years. Even those businesses with some lease protection, and they are a rarity among small-business men, can recover nothing for moving expenses under the present law.

This is a tragic and demoralizing situation to our business community. Many small-business men will be forced to give up their businesses and others will be faced with bankruptcy unless help is forthcoming. In the case of our community, it is an emergency situation and help is needed at once.

I think I can best explain the situation that exists with our business men and women by giving you two specific examples.

I would like to tell you about a repair and storage garage tenant that has been serving our community since 1926—30 years.

The owner of this business is 62 years old. The building in which he is located is being removed because the land is needed to complete the plan.

This businessman has been operating with 5-year leases. His lease expires a year from July. The land clearance commission has an option to buy the building subject to his lease and they have indicated to him their intention of buying the property and letting him finish out the term of his lease.

The owner of the property will be fully compensated. The business tenant will get nothing. He has expensive built-in car lifts, special electric wiring for welding, floor ex-

hausts, and other equipment that is difficult, and in some cases impossible, to move.

The expense of moving and reinstalling this equipment will be substantial if he can even find a place to which to move. He will certainly need long-term, low-interest financing to set up in a new location and to carry him until he builds a new clientele. As a result of redevelopment he must start over again from scratch after spending a lifetime building up his business.

I also want to tell you about my own business, of which I am general manager. This is the Hyde Park Cooperative Society, Inc., a consumers cooperative which operates a food supermarket. Our business was incorporated in 1933 and, incidentally, included the present senior Senator from Illinois as one of its first members. The demolition of our building will hurt the ownership equity of 2,200 neighborhood shareholders. Our shareholders include householders in the neighborhood and in the University of Chicago community. For example, our present alderman who is here today is a long-time shareholder and so is our former alderman, Bob Merriam, who is now in Washington as Assistant to the Director of the Budget.

I do not consider ours quite as fatal a hardship case as is the repair and storage garage case I just told you about. We have a long-term lease for which we may receive some compensation. However, our moving expenses will be great because of the large amount of refrigeration equipment involved in a modern food store. We are one of the very few business tenants who may receive compensation for our leasehold.

Whatever amount we may receive for our lease, nothing will be included to cover the cost of our moving. We also will need a long-term loan at low interest to help make the transition to a new place of business.

These cases illustrate the problems faced by the small-business men of our community. Through no fault of their own they are being forced to move by the Government. Therefore, on behalf of the Hyde Park Business and Professional Association, I wish to add our strong support to H. R. 9351.

Statement of Bruce Sagan, publisher of the Hyde Park Herald, of Chicago:

My name is Bruce Sagan. I live at 1229 East 50th Street, Chicago, Ill. I am the publisher of the Hyde Park Herald, a weekly newspaper which has been published in my neighborhood for 75 years.

Hyde Park is one of Chicago's oldest communities and has contributed a great deal to the life of the city. But its age is catching up, and Hyde Park is now the location of the Nation's first urban renewal program.

We are appearing today to testify for a bill to help merchants caught in the cross currents of community redevelopment.

There is at present a federally approved redevelopment project in our neighborhood. This project covers about a 10-block stretch of our present business community.

I think the attitude of the merchants can best be summed up by a druggist who will lose his business because of the project. He said, "It is necessary—some of these buildings should have been torn down 20 years ago when I first came here."

This is the comment of a man who is about to see 20 years of effort taken away from him.

The merchant tenant is the man on the low end of the redevelopment pole. I have brought with me and wish to file with you a series of reprints of articles which have appeared in the Hyde Park Herald. The first is a reprint of an editorial written 1 year ago. In it we said:

"The businessman is the left-out fellow of redevelopment. The land clearance commission is obliged by law to find a standard housing unit to relocate a tenant who loses his dwelling. A building owner is paid a fair market price for his property. But no one

pays the business tenant for his years of work, nor does anyone have to worry about where he goes. . . .

"He receives nothing for the good will of his business. There is no compensation for the time spent in building customer relations."

Included in these reprints are the stories of 15 merchants who are losing their places of business. These stories cover a broad field of the independent merchants of our community.

One of these displaced merchants is an automobile dealer. He has been in our neighborhood since 1924 and has built his garage business into an automobile agency. In 1948 he was able to purchase a franchise from one of the "big three" automobile manufacturers.

At that time he spent \$85,000 to remodel his garage, over and above the thousands of dollars in garage equipment already installed. He has 14 twin post automobile lifts. The redevelopment plan will probably bankrupt this business. There are a number of reasons. Under the terms of their valuable franchise they can only move within a mile square area. There is no place in that area for them to move. A new building is needed. But if a developer were to build them such a building, at their regular profit levels they would be unable to meet the required rent. This business cannot afford to lose the improvements they have put in the building, but they cannot afford to move them either.

This business, which has been built from a small auto garage into an agency with 75,000 square feet of space will go out of business without the kind of help this bill would give.

One of the ready-to-wear stores in the project is typical of the central problem of age. This modern, recently done glass front is just below a large cement block on the second floor. On the block is written 1888.

This building, put up in the last century has several floors of living quarters which have passed their useful life, but on the ground floor is the new glass front of a going business.

The store is owned by a young man only 29 years old. His family has owned stores in our neighborhood since 1907. He purchased his present store in 1949 and has tripled its volume since then.

In 1953 he completely remodeled the store front and put in air conditioning at his own expense. He will lose all these improvements worth between \$15,000 and \$20,000.

He says that moving will be hard on him but that he is still young and able to accommodate himself. I spoke with him on Monday and he asked me a question which I will pass on to you. "What," he said, "will happen to the old couple who own the newsstand on the corner. The \$750 they paid for the stand means as much to them as \$17,000 means to me. What will happen to them? Will they become dependent on the State for charity?"

The stories, of course, are endless.

I would like to urge that you pass the present bill with all due speed. Some of these men are already being forced to move. This is as much a disaster for them as a storm or flood.

I would also like to urge consideration of extending this idea into the area of compensation for the loss of the business. There is no legislation which compensates a merchant for lost goodwill. Goodwill, although supposed to be an intangible, is something that is measured daily by buyers and sellers of businesses and insurance companies paying business interruption insurance.

I hope that you will give this measure affirmative consideration and see to it that it becomes law before it is too late to help our businessmen.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HAYWORTH (at the request of Mr. MACHROWICZ), from May 3, 1956, to May 9, 1956, on account of illness.

Mr. SCRIVNER, for the next 4 days, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. SIKES, on Thursday of next week, for 20 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. McVEY.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio.

Mr. DODD (at the request of Mr. MADSEN) in three instances.

Mr. FORAND on Rhode Island Independence Day which will be celebrated tomorrow.

Mr. ROBINO (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK).

Mr. CELLER (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1603. An act to terminate the prohibition against employment of Mongolian labor in the construction of reclamation projects;

H. R. 4781. An act to authorize the Territory of Alaska to incur indebtedness, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4852. An act for the relief of Joseph Gangemi and Anthony Gangemi;

H. R. 7952. An act to require the inspection and certification of certain vessels carrying passengers;

H. R. 8535. An act to amend the act of July 4, 1955, relating to the construction of irrigation distribution systems; and

H. J. Res. 513. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built cargo vessels and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 7, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1809. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress, amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1810. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the construction of 2 prototype ships, and the conversion of 1 Liberty ship, by the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce," to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 10986. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report on Personnel Programs and Policies of the Federal Government in overseas operations; without amendment (Rept. No. 2109). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JUDD: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 9606. A bill to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCCARTHY: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 8636. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1957, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIES: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3076. An act to provide for a continuing survey and special studies of sickness and disability in the United States, and for periodic reports of the results thereof, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2045. A bill for the relief of Joe Bargas; with amendment (Rept. No. 2105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4037. A bill for the relief of Truck & Axle Manufacturing Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 10986. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 10987. A bill to amend the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 to permit the use of vessel revolving funds for vessel activation and deactivation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROTHILL:

H. R. 10988. A bill to provide a remedy for injuries to persons and property caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any individual granted diplomatic immunity by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10989. A bill to provide permanent reemployment priority for persons holding career appointments in the competitive civil service who are separated from such service other than for cause; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 10990. A bill to authorize the Corps of Engineers to compensate the city of Williston, N. Dak. for the acquisition and replacement of the municipal water supply and water treatment facilities which will be damaged, impaired, or rendered inoperative by the construction and operation of Garrison Dam and Reservoir on the Missouri River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 10991. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and to encourage small-business concerns to engage in foreign trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois (by request):

H. R. 10992. A bill to amend section 158 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, so as to include the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare among the executive departments there listed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 10993. A bill to amend the act of August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 868), with respect to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 10994. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to increase the amounts which may be made available thereunder as grants to States for maternal and child welfare; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 10995. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 10996. A bill amending the act of June 22, 1936, applying to channel improvement or channel rectification projects for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 10997. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 10998. A bill to exclude certain lands from the Sequoia National Park, in the State

of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 10999. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Spokane Valley Federal reclamation project, Washington and Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 11000. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of the late Justice Louis Dembitz Brandeis; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. R. 11001. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 11002. A bill to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 11003. A bill to provide for increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 11004. A bill to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 11005. A bill to establish as a policy of the Congress public use of public domain forest lands and woodlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 11006. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for carrying out provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain timber access roads, to permit maximum economy in harvesting national forest timber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 11007. A bill to provide that the owners of land acquired for public works projects shall in certain cases be entitled to reimbursement for resettlement costs resulting from such acquisition; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 11008. A bill to provide that the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act shall not

apply to persons attempting to influence the adoption by the Congress of proposed amendments to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 11009. A bill amending section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. R. 11010. A bill creating the Muscatine Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 11011. A bill to impose an additional 10 cents a pound tax on synthetic tobacco, tobacco stems, or tobacco scraps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H. R. 11012. A bill to provide for the establishment of a new fish hatchery at Cedar Bluff Reservoir, Trego County, Kans.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 11013. A bill to provide for the disposal of the Government-owned synthetic rubber research laboratories at Akron, Ohio; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 236. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the Virgin Islands Code as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. Res. 495. Resolution to convey testimony and findings of the Katyn Special Committee to the United Nations and the Polish Communist Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. Res. 496. Resolution to convey testimony and findings of the Katyn Special Committee to the United Nations and the Polish Communist Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Res. 497. Resolution requesting the President to forward the evidence and findings of the Select Committee To Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Facts, Evidence, and Circumstances of the Katyn Forest Massacre to the United States Mission to the United Nations for appropriate action, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 11014. A bill for the relief of Warren S. Parr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 11015. A bill for the relief of Dr. Shun-hsin Chou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 11016. A bill for the relief of Jeanne Marie-Louise Hoez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 11017. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John R. Devereux for disability retirement as a Reserve officer or Army of the United States officer under the provisions of the act of April 3, 1939, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 11018. A bill for the relief of Kang Jung Soon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 11019. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to consummate desirable land exchanges; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 11020. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Remaria Aveari a Marama Geronimo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

994. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Local 63, Lea Worker Division, A. M. C. and B. A. of N. A., Williamsport, Pa., protesting the continuance of the 20 percent amusement tax imposed upon the entertainment industry, and urging its repeal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

995. By Mr. MULTER: Petition for separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

996. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, the Anchorage Republican Club, Anchorage, Alaska, requesting that prompt and effective action be taken to bring the Alaska statehood bill out of committee and place it before the Congress for consideration and approval; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, May 10 is Rumanian Independence Day. It is only fitting that we should remember this day, for it serves as a grim reminder of Communist aggression and subversion which made captive satellites out of the once free nations of Eastern Europe.

CII—470

An unwilling pawn in the power struggle of Nazi domination and Soviet Communist conquest, Rumania has long been a land of suffering. The high hopes which Rumanian patriots had for their country when on May 10, 1866, they crowned Charles, Prince of Rumania, and thus founded the Rumanian dynasty, have been badly shattered. Today, Rumania lies prostrate in the tight grip of the Soviet Union, which not only enslaves these proud people, but robs them of their national resources to help pay for the Communist trade offensive.

The Kremlin's tyrants who rule the country are trying their best to eradicate May 10 from the memory of the people. They have replaced Independence Day

with the Day of Soviet Victory, which falls on May 9. But when the alien flags are hoisted on May 9, it must remind the Rumanian people of their own Independence Day. To them it is but a sign that the day will come again when they will rid themselves of the foreign oppressor and the local quislings who take their orders from the Kremlin.

I believe that the days of party boss Gheorge Gheorghiu-Dej and of his henchmen are numbered. They came to power under Stalin. But Stalin himself has now been toppled from his exalted position, and with him will topple all those who owe him allegiance. We have seen it happen in recent weeks in Bulgaria, in Poland, in Czechoslovakia. Though

the Rumanian Communists are trying to postpone the day of reckoning, though they still are slow in following the de-Stalinization line prescribed by their masters in the Kremlin, they cannot escape the inevitable. As Stalin rid himself of those who became inconvenient to him, the new Kremlin bosses will not hesitate to liquidate those of their underlings who have become politically inexpedient, for communism devours its own children. May its appetite increase.

On May 10, we salute a suffering nation which has lost its independence through no fault of its own, but was the tragic victim of brute Communist force. On this anniversary of their independence, we assure the Rumanian people that they do not stand alone, or abandoned, in their aspiration for freedom. Let us remind them of our pledge, which is part of official United States foreign policy, that the people of America will never consent to their continued enslavement; that the United States will continue its efforts to correct the wrong, and relieve the suffering, which has been brought upon helpless nations by Communist aggression, subversion, and betrayal.

Definite Relief for Cotton Growers Required

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith the text of a letter I sent to Secretary Benson, on April 25, 1956:

Hon. EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington 25, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This letter is to bring to your attention the plight of the extra long staple cotton growers in the United States, and to ask your best effort in alleviating the current conditions.

Basically, the problem facing our domestic producers are directly traceable to excessive imports of long staple cotton from Egypt.

It is my purpose to request that you use the provision of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to deal with this matter. As you know, under the provisions of this Act the Secretary of Agriculture has the right and the responsibility to recommend to the President the initiation of proceedings looking toward import restrictions, when such imports are shown to be the detriment of domestic producers.

Currently, foreign grown cotton accounts for almost 100 percent of American mill consumption. Most of this foreign cotton is purchased from Egypt, while our own cotton is stored in warehouses and domestic acreage is further decreased. Our imports from Egypt have reached 95,000 bales annually, the near-maximum under the quota system.

Time was when our State Department advocated liberal importing of cotton from Egypt to discourage that nation's trade with Communist-controlled nations. But the record shows that Egypt has increased trade with these Red nations, and her attitude toward the United States and other freedom-loving nations has become suspect, thus the

original contention of the State Department is destroyed.

Egypt has acted, overall, in a manner very hostile to the United States. She protested our spending money paid us by the Italians for defense bases in Italy. She asked for our aid in building the Aswan Dam, accepted our offer to do so, and turned her back on the United States to deal even more with Russia. She demanded our money to buy planes and train pilots to fight army boll-worms attacking Egyptian cotton.

General Nasser, dictator of Egypt, has been responsible for the present crises in the Middle East, due to his acceptance of Red arms from Czechoslovakia. Those arms include submarines which will fly the Egyptian flag but be manned by Communist technicians under Russian tutelage. Those subs will ply the Mediterranean in the shadow of our 6th Fleet.

Egypt refused to import much of our surplus wheat, at a time when we desperately needed a new wheat market, yet she accepted wheat from Russia during this same period.

It does not seem logical, nor in the interest of fair play and justice, to continue to appease a nation definitely hostile to the United States, and particularly to the detriment of our domestic cotton growers and at the expense of their cotton market. Enlightened self-interest requires the action requested herein.

I, therefore, strongly urge your using section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to lower the import quota and to place a tariff designed to protect American interests on foreign-produced extra-long staple cotton.

Your prompt attention, consideration, and reply will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully yours,
EMANUEL CELLER.

Singing Rockets, Student Choir, Rich Township High School, Park Forest, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, it will be my pleasure tomorrow to welcome to our Capital City a fine group of students from the Rich Township High School in Park Forest, Ill., which is located in the Fourth Congressional District that I represent. Rich Township High School serves the 30,000 residents of Matteson, Olympia Fields, Park Forest, Richton Park, and adjoining rural areas. About three-fourths of the student body comes from the new city of Park Forest, which is located 30 miles south of Chicago's Loop. While Park Forest is only about 7 years old, it has a population of about 25,000 people. It has been recognized as a model, new community and recently received the National All-American City Award.

This group of approximately 70 boys and girls has been selected from 350 students in regular vocal training at Rich High, and are known as the Singing Rockets. It is my hope that some of you will have the opportunity to hear them when they sing on the steps of the Capitol at 12:30 tomorrow afternoon.

They are the only choral group in their class to receive superior ratings in all competitive categories in the Illinois State music contests. Singing in seven foreign languages, performing equally well spirituals and religious numbers, popular music, and ballads, the Singing Rockets are in wide demand at local and State meetings and conferences, as well as at national conventions.

Gov. William G. Stratton, of Illinois, has designated the Singing Rockets to be the official State representative on the Ed Sullivan Show commemorating National Music Week on Sunday, May 6, 1956. I feel confident that should you, my colleagues, see their performance on the Ed Sullivan Show, you will feel that my pride in calling them to your attention is highly justified.

Seniors and juniors are included in the Singing Rockets, and there are about an equal number of boys and girls. Their annual tours are financed through fundraising projects which are entirely student directed. This year they have raised \$7,000 for their trip to Washington and New York by doing odd jobs, baby-sitting, and benefit performances. Their annual tour last year included performances in three States—Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan. Their choral work is done in addition to their regular class work. Meeting but 2 hours a week in rehearsal, they are recognized by well-known choral experts as one of the truly great teen-age student choirs in the Nation.

America, the greatest Nation in the world, has little to fear that juvenile delinquency will break down the moral fiber of our country, when it can proudly present such fine young citizens.

The Claims of Former Polish Prisoners of War Now Residing in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, May 3 is the anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, and this time of year therefore seems appropriate to call attention to the plight of Polish former prisoners of war now living in the United States.

These soldiers were members of the Polish armed forces and fought with the Allies against the enemy in various theaters of operation. During the course of the war, some of these soldiers were captured by the Nazis. Now, according to the provisions of the Geneva Convention of 1929, to which Nazi Germany was a party, prisoners of war are entitled to certain benefits as well as good treatment. Article 34 of the convention provides that upon their release prisoners of war shall receive both their unpaid military pay and wages for labor while they were prisoners. The convention also provides that prisoners who are forced to live in unsanitary conditions and who are not provided with food equal

in quality and quantity to that provided by the country to its own soldiers, shall receive compensation. The Polish ex-prisoners claim that Nazi Germany violated all these provisions.

The normal procedure for adjusting claims for violations of the Geneva Convention is for the country of which the prisoners of war are citizens to handle it. For example, in the United States, claims by Americans who were prisoners were adjusted through the War Claims Act of 1948. The fund established by this act was made up of confiscated assets of Germany and Japan, and money from this fund was used to pay American citizens who filed legitimate claims.

Unfortunately, these Polish former prisoners, now residing in the United States, found themselves in an unusual position after the war. Since Poland had been occupied by the Communists, they refused to return to their homeland, and the Communists therefore ignored their claims against Germany.

To add to their predicament, the German authorities insisted that any claims against the German state or its legal successor could not be made by an individual alien citizen, but only by his government. They also stated that these Poles should have collected their claims through the reparation fund established for Poland at the Potsdam Conference and controlled by Poland's Communist government. The Polish ex-prisoners have therefore been unable to collect their just claims.

Many of these Polish ex-prisoners now living in the United States have just claims and have been denied them largely as a result of their refusal to return to Communist Poland. We have met the similar claims of our own former prisoners of war out of the captured German assets that were put into the war claims fund, and it seems to me there is a case for adding to the list of those eligible to compensation from that fund these Poles who are now living in the United States. In the spirit of justice and equity, then, I would like to urge the Department of State, to whom these Polish former prisoners of war have presented their case, to give every consideration to their pleas and to arrange some way of satisfying the legitimate claims of Polish ex-prisoners now living in the United States from the war claims fund established to meet the similar claims of American citizens.

Military Supplies Go Forward to Saudi Arabia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the latest disclosure that the United States continues to supply arms to Saudi Arabia, as evidenced by the loading of reported bomb casings, rockets, and 76-millimeter

shells on the *Monterrey* at South Port, N. C., highlights the dangerous, impossible, and contradictory position in which the administration has placed itself by supplying arms and ammunition to the Arab nations and at the same time denying arms and ammunition to Israel.

If it is a shipment of military supplies to Saudi Arabia, it is labeled a routine operation, but the shipment of such equipment to Israel, we are told, would be an arms race. We have supplied Iraq with arms and Saudi Arabia with arms and offered arms to Egypt. And yet, in questioning before the Congress, Mr. Dulles has said, "America is not the traditional supplier of arms to the Middle East."

It seems that if the Arab nations need further encouragement to truculence, we have given it to them. We can only incite Arab belligerence by our willingness to be wooed and won. We know full well that appeasement is not the road to peace. We know as well that an imbalance of power in any region of the world is a threat to the peace. It is that very premise upon which our own defense strategy is based.

This latest shipment of ammunition to Saudi Arabia emphasizes our failure to cope directly and intelligently with the Middle East situation. We are inviting disaster and bankrupting our moral leadership.

If the United States continues to sell arms to the Arab nations, it cannot at the same time deny Israel the defensive weapons which could restore the balance of power and more surely insure the peace.

S. 3879

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important that this House adopt S. 3879, which reads as follows:

S. 3879

An act to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States, in order to balance the power now heavily weighted in favor of automobile manufacturers, by enabling franchise automobile dealers to bring suit in the district courts of the United States to recover compensatory damages sustained by reason of the failure of automobile manufacturers to act in good faith in complying with the terms of franchises or in terminating or not renewing franchises with their dealers.

Be it enacted, etc.—

SEC. 1. As used in this act—

(a) The term "automobile manufacturer" shall mean any person, partnership, corporation, association, or other form of business enterprise engaged in the manufacturing or assembling of passenger cars, trucks, station wagons, or other automotive vehicles, including any person, partnership, or corporation which acts for such manufacturer or assembler in connection with the distribution of said automotive vehicles.

(b) The term "franchise" shall mean the agreement, contract, understanding, or arrangement between any automobile manu-

facturer and any automobile dealer which purports to fix the legal rights and liabilities of the parties to such agreement, contract, understanding, or agreement.

(c) The term "automobile dealer" shall mean any person, partnership, corporation, association, or other form of business enterprise operating under the terms of a franchise and engaged in the sale or distribution of passenger cars, trucks, station wagons, or other automotive vehicles.

(d) The term "commerce" shall mean commerce among the several States of the United States or with foreign nations, or in any Territory of the United States or in the District of Columbia, or among the Territories or between any Territory and any State or foreign nation, or between the District of Columbia and any State or Territory or foreign nation.

(e) The term "good faith" shall mean the duty of each party to any franchise, and all officers, employees, or agents to act in a fair, equitable, and nonarbitrary manner so as to guarantee such other party freedom from coercion, intimidation, or threats of coercion or intimidation, so as to preserve all equities of such other party which are inherent in the nature of the relationship between such parties by such franchise.

SEC. 2. An automobile dealer may bring suit against any automobile manufacturer engaged in commerce, in any district court of the United States in the district in which said manufacturer resides, or is found, or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover compensatory damages by him sustained and the cost of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee, by reason of the failure of said automobile manufacturer to act in good faith in performing or complying with any of the terms or provisions of the franchise, or in terminating, canceling, or not renewing the franchise with said dealer: *Provided*, That in any such suit the manufacturer shall not be barred from asserting in defense of any such action the failure of the dealer to act in good faith.

I have suggested to members of the Judiciary Committee that this legislation be passed, and I urged favorable report on this legislation.

The statement which I submitted to the Judiciary Committee is as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the subcommittee, it is my sincere conviction that the enactment of the legislation being considered today, S. 3879, will be a significant step forward in freeing thousands of automobile dealers from what amounts to economic bondage.

An automobile dealership represents a substantial investment, not only in money, but also in effort. It seems obvious to me that these small-business men are entitled to the protection of the law in their relationships with manufacturers, since under the present system they can be forced out of business almost at the whim of the supplier.

S. 3879 represents a fair and equitable attempt to bring at least a measure of security to the thousands of automobile dealers in the country. It is not intended to underwrite poor judgment on the part of the dealer in his business dealings, as has been charged by opponents of the bill. But it will give him his "day in court" if he believes that the manufacturer has treated him unjustly.

Section 1 (e), the so-called good-faith portion of the bill, seems to me an excellent way to insure that all parties in any dealer-manufacturer franchise arrangement will maintain high standards of business ethics. The critics of this legislation have advanced the old argument that Government should not interfere needlessly with the conduct of private business. Unfortunately, however, the automobile industry has made little or

no progress in achieving better dealer relationships and, indeed, the abuses have been increasing at an alarming rate.

Many dealers have been forced to the wall by the practice of shipping unwanted cars to them—cars that cannot be absorbed in the market because of the senseless race among some manufacturers for first place in sales volume. The manufacturers have sometimes totally ignored the saturation point where dealer cannot sell the product in legitimate commerce. Consider the plight of a dealer who can sell about 20 new cars a month at a maximum who is forced to accept delivery of 25 or 30 cars. If he refuses to accept the number of cars that the district representative of the manufacturer arbitrarily sets as his quota, his dealership can be canceled on a unilateral basis.

I think, in all fairness, that any businessman is entitled to a far better break than that. Under the provisions of the bill under discussion here today, he would at least have the chance to bring suit and possibly to recover damages.

The pressure that has been brought to bear on the country's independent automobile dealers by some manufacturers to accept more cars than they can reasonably hope to sell has resulted in a grave deterioration in marketing techniques. To avoid bankruptcy, some dealers in desperation have resorted to shoddy service work, deceptive and dishonest advertising, and the "packing" of insurance and finance charges as well as the "packing" of the prices of cars. Automobile overproduction has led unavoidably to the practice of "bootlegging," which undermines public confidence in the entire industry.

Many dealers from my own State of Connecticut have expressed the strongest possible support for the good faith aspect of the bill. They feel that the enactment of this legislation will have a wholesome effect upon the automobile industry, lead to better dealer-manufacturer relationships, and ultimately be of benefit to our entire economy.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in this effort to pass this very necessary legislation.

Liberation Day—Ethiopia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to send greetings to the Ethiopian people, His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie I, Emperor of Ethiopia, and His Excellency Yilma Deressa, Ambassador of Ethiopia, on the occasion of the celebration of the 15th anniversary of Liberation Day, May 5, 1956.

Ethiopia has been an independent sovereign state from time immemorial. Ethiopia was a great power when recorded history began. With the march of tyranny and totalitarianism across Europe in the years immediately preceding World War I, the Government of Ethiopia was forced to take refuge outside its own territory. Ethiopia, as well as the United States, never recognized Italian sovereignty over Ethiopian soil.

When in 1935 Ethiopia tested the League of Nations on the principle of collective security very little comfort was given her. Emperor Selassie was one of

the few men of courage who read correctly the signs of those turbulent times. He cautioned the free world to resist the advance of totalitarianism and pled with the world to rally its forces to stop unwarranted aggression. Emperor Selassie voiced the cry not only for Ethiopia but for liberty-loving people everywhere. While the free world slept, appeased, or turned its attention away from Africa, the forces of nazism and fascism pursued their deadly course.

Ethiopia virtually stood alone against a towering enemy. The people of Ethiopia fought valiantly for the life of their nation. After a series of military reverses, the enemy destroyed the independence of Ethiopia for the first time in 3,000 years. Emperor Haile Selassie I took his cause to the League of Nations. When that organization failed to respond to his plea for the principle of collective security he was forced into exile.

On May 5, 1941, exactly 5 years after occupation forces had taken over Addis Ababa, His Imperial Majesty reentered Addis Ababa at the head of his resistance forces and with British troops which had fought their way into Ethiopia from the Sudan. One of his first official acts was to call upon his people to follow Christian principles and forego acts of revenge against the tens of thousands of Italians who had been trapped by the liberation forces.

In the years since liberation, Ethiopia has tenaciously bent her energies toward the reestablishment of the country and the continuation of forward-looking projects which had been interrupted by the invasion and occupation. On July 16, 1931, less than a year after he assumed leadership of his country, Emperor Selassie had given the people their first written constitution. Through this act the Emperor demonstrated his adherence to the basic principles of democracy. The constitution, in effect, transferred part of the Emperor's authority to a parliament and a judicial system and provided for administrative departments. Another integral part of Haile Selassie's preoccupation program consisted of efforts at modernization of the country. Special attention was given to the development of health services and a broader system of education, the opening of hospitals and schools, and the recruitment of doctors and teachers. It will be remembered that the occupation authorities, as a matter of policy, suppressed all educational activities between the invasion and the liberation. As a part of the nation's reconstruction program a program was launched which took advantage of every instructional facility offered the nation from abroad. Ethiopia appropriated a large portion of the nation's budget for educational purposes.

Ethiopia and the United States have passed the midcentury mark in the history of their diplomatic relations. Friendly and cooperative relations with the United States in full support of the principle of collective security are the bases of Ethiopia's foreign policy. Ethiopia was one of the first countries to come to the support of the United Na-

tions when the General Assembly condemned Communist aggression in Korea and asked member nations to assist in halting hostilities. Ethiopia reports that:

Ethiopia's Kagnew Battalion, integrated into the United States 7th Division, served until the Korean truce was arranged and established a unique record for troops in that conflict. None of its members were captured, although the battalion suffered casualties as great as those of other units around it. When positions held by Kagnew soldiers were overrun by the enemy, all Ethiopian troops died at their posts. None surrendered.

Ethiopia can look with pride upon its record. I salute this nation of stalwart people and pray for them continued peace and prosperity as they go forward into a new year of national life.

Rhode Island Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is independence day for the great State of Rhode Island. One hundred and eighty years ago tomorrow the State of Rhode Island dissolved all legal and moral ties with her mother country, Great Britain. By repealing an act entitled "An act for the more effectual securing to his Majesty the allegiance of his subjects in this His Colony and Dominion of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations."

On May 4, 1776 Rhode Island formally severed all social, political, and economic association with Great Britain. The events that led up to these acts of impunity are concisely and authoritatively recited in our history books.

In 1763 the English Government determined to institute a program to strengthen colonial administration, and to raise colonial revenue. Each of these measures was eminently unpopular in America, but the question of a colonial revenue proved to be the principal pivot of controversy. At the close of the French and Indian Wars the British public debt was overburdening and in England the taxpayers were clamoring for relief. To help defray the expenses of the new colonial policy parliament, in 1764, passed the sugar act, imposing a tax on imports of foreign molasses into America. This was the first instance of a parliamentary act designed for the express purpose of raising a colonial revenue.

The sugar act provoked a storm of protest. In spite of these protests, parliament proceeded, in 1765, to a still more objectionable revenue measure—the stamp act—whereby a tax was levied on all legal and commercial papers, pamphlets, newspapers, almanacs, cards, and dice. Immediately rioting broke out, because of these imposts, and British goods were boycotted.

In 1766 a new ministry in England repealed the stamp act and reduced the duties imposed by the sugar act. Within a few months however, still another ministry was in power and the attempt to raise a colonial revenue was renewed. By one of the Townshend acts of 1767 duties were imposed on imports of glass, lead, paint, paper, and tea. Again the colonies responded with a boycott of British merchandise.

Colonial resentment found expression in a series of incidents, many of which occurred in Rhode Island. As early as 1764 Newporters climaxed a riot with crewmen of the British schooner *St. John* by firing upon the vessel with cannons. The following year a Newport mob, angered by impressment of American seamen, seized and burned one of the boats of the British vessel *Maidstone*. Most famous in this series of incidents was the burning of the British revenue schooner *Gaspee*.

After the *Gaspee* affair tensions rose to a climax. In 1773 Rhode Island formed a committee of correspondence for cooperation with the other colonies. On December 16, 1773, the Boston Tea Party was staged to protest a British plan for stimulating the sale of taxed tea. This defiant action, which caused the British to retaliate with coercive legislation known as the Intolerable Acts, was vehemently discussed and approved by town meetings in Rhode Island. The Bristol town meeting boldly asserted that the time might come when the people would be provoked to renounce their allegiance and assert an independency.

The colonial spirit of independency was the rock on which Britain's North American empire was finally wrecked. Accustomed for more than a generation to little or no taxation, and to nearly complete freedom in the management of their internal affairs, the Americans were disposed to resent every British attempt to strengthen colonial administration. Free from the menace of New France, strong and self-confident, the Thirteen Colonies prepared to resist.

In 1774, Rhode Island gave support to the calling of the Continental Congress, naming as delegates the former political rivals Stephen Hopkins and Samuel Ward. In 1775, upon receipt of the news of Concord and Lexington, the general assembly created an army of observation—most of the troops later joined Washington's Continental Army. The same year the assembly commissioned its own navy, consisting of two units, to protect the colony's trade. Before the year was out, this force had attacked and captured a vessel of the Royal Navy. On May 4, 1776, the Rhode Island General Assembly climaxed its program of resistance by formally declaring its freedom from Britain. This action, taken 2 months before the Declaration of Independence at Philadelphia, made Rhode Island the first sovereign state established by Europeans in the New World.

This formal declaration of freedom has been called the "shot heard around the world."

Our State's firmness lies in her record. Rhode Island still remains the land of "firsts." The circumstances have changed the times, but the character and

determination still lies dormant only to be kindled by any sort of tyranny over the mind of man.

Rhode Island is a proud State. Her people are progressive and hard working. The products of her workmen can be found in every part of the world. It is the cradle of religious liberty in America.

We shall continue to be proud and independent. We shall continue to work for the good of all and oppose all things that are not in the public interest.

Radio and Television Address by Hon. Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, Station WEAR, Pensacola, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I insert a radio and television address given by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, Tennessee, in Pensacola, Fla., on Monday, April 30, 1956:

I want to talk with you this evening about a significant new development, which is now in the process of formation in the foreign policy of our Nation.

It is important that we consider it, because foreign policy—the question of peace or war—is by far the over-riding question with which you and I are faced today or any day.

Our economic structure, our jobs, our farm income, the highways and roads that we build, the schools that we construct, our social-security system—all of these are of necessity tailored to the question of whether we are in the shadow of war or on the brink of peace.

The peace and security of your family and mine is based as much upon decisions that may be made 3,000 miles from here as they are on the decisions that we ourselves made at our breakfast table this morning.

Therefore, I wanted to talk with you about some of those decisions this evening.

Tomorrow the Secretary of State will leave Washington for Paris to attend a session of the North Atlantic Council. He has said that he has some thoughts to exchange on the question of transforming the North Atlantic Alliance into a broader association of free nations. He has said that without cutting back western military strength, the foreign-policy accent of the United States should be shifted to the economic and political fields.

My reaction is, it's about time.

This is the emphasis that I have been seeking to achieve in our policy toward the Western nations ever since I became a Member of the Senate.

It is most certainly the emphasis that I would pursue should I be chosen as the next President of the United States.

Therefore, I can wholeheartedly give my support and encouragement to the Secretary in his present mission—and say that this is at least one trip on his part which I consider is necessary.

In adopting this new attitude, it is my feeling that the Secretary of State is at long last expressing the kind of sentiments which find their birth within the mainstream of American thinking and culture. A brief review of the development of our North

Atlantic relationships will, I believe, bear that out.

Five years have passed since a President of the United States who has been much abused and much criticized, but who will go down in history as a man who made the right decisions on the big issues, signed the NATO agreements. I am speaking, of course, of President Truman. This NATO agreement was a dramatic—and a highly successful—step in the effort to control and contain militant communism.

From its very inception, it seems to me, these Western democracies which entered into the NATO agreements were taking a step which inevitably would grow and develop into a new concept of relationships among nations.

In the North Atlantic Treaty itself they declared themselves "determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law."

They agreed, in article 2 of the treaty, to "contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions." They agreed to "seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies." They agreed to "encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them."

Now why was it that they could do that? The reason was simply that we are so much alike—we residents of the United States and Canada and England, and the free nations of Europe. We may have differences in accents and languages, but we are alike in our love of freedom, in our respect for the dignity of every man, in our fierce belief in democratic institutions, in our pursuit of liberty.

Basically, however, despite these larger concepts the NATO agreements were and have remained treaties of military agreements.

For a long time I have thought they should be more. You see, wars do not just occur. More often than not we stumble into them. Like all disputes, an action here, a word there, a misunderstanding, an underestimation—these are the things of which wars are made. I therefore felt that since we were binding ourselves, one to the other, to fight one for all, we ought to have some kind of channel—some kind of arrangement—by which we could also forge common policies for peace.

Shortly after I entered the Senate, I filed a resolution which would have inaugurated the grassroots search for methods of accomplishing the kind of political and economic cooperation which the treaty envisioned and which the Secretary now seeks in his talks beginning tomorrow.

This resolution called upon the President to invite the democracies which sponsored the treaty to name delegates, representing their principal political parties, to meet with delegates of the United States in convention. There they would explore how far their peoples might go in applying the principles which our own States applied when they formed an enduring union.

I secured among the cosponsors of this resolution a broad and non-partisan backing among Members of the Senate. I am proud that so many distinguished southerners appeared on this resolution. The South has never failed in its traditional leadership in matters of foreign policy. The resolution was not adopted, however.

We did, nevertheless, maintain excellent relationships with our Western friends for the succeeding few years. Then our entire Atlantic policy went into eclipse. Why was this?

In the first place, with the advent of the Eisenhower administration, those of us who believed in an enlightened foreign policy, including the President himself, found it necessary to spend a great part of our time

in a type of guerrilla warfare against powerful go-it-alone and isolationist elements within the GOP itself.

The isolationist, the go-it-alone exponents, had a curious counterpart within the Republican Party in those who preached the doctrine of preventive war. It was their influence, I feel, which contributed toward the Secretary of State's unfortunate pronouncement of the doctrine of "massive retaliation." This seriously deterred the progress we had been making in our Western relations for it understandably frightened our allies in Europe. In event of a global hydrogen war, they would stand exposed to massive annihilation.

Another great obstacle in the path of real Atlantic cooperation during those first years of the Eisenhower administration was the single-minded obsession of United States policy with the European Defense Community. It was rather obstinate on our part to try to force upon the European nations a union which many of them did not want, and which we and Great Britain would not join.

Well, the French refused to ratify EDC. We had no alternative to propose, but the British did. Through the London-Paris agreements, far superior to what was proposed in EDC, Western Germany became an equal partner in NATO. NATO was strengthened in many respects and for the first time a sort of international control over armaments was established among a group of sovereign States.

I then felt that the time had again come when we should push forward toward these economic and political goals and when the present Congress convened, I introduced again my proposal for a convention of the NATO sponsors.

The world is ready for this move. A former great Secretary of State and military commander, Gen. George Marshall, endorsed my proposal. He wrote: "There is no blinking that fact that this country now stands at a turning point in its relations to its traditional friends among the nations of the Old World."

Another great statesman, Robert Schuman, former Premier of France and the author of the Schuman plan joined the author of the Marshall plan in endorsing my proposal. He said:

"If the American Congress accepts the Atlantic proposal of Senator KEFAUVER, all the democratic European nations should be happy to accept the invitation to send delegates to such a Study Commission. Should there result from the work of this conference and from later proposals the outline of an acceptable plan of union * * * we would then certainly have made a great step toward world peace and general prosperity."

Paul-Henri Spaak, foreign minister of Belgium; Paul Van Zeeland former prime minister of Belgium; Gaetano Martino, foreign minister of Italy—all sent words of encouragement and endorsement.

Said Mr. Spaak:

"I personally hope that such discussions will take place between the citizens of the Atlantic nations very soon."

Said Mr. Van Zeeland:

"To sum up, it would be a major step toward peace and prosperity throughout the world."

Said Mr. Martino:

"I agree with Senator KEFAUVER that the peace of the world cannot be assured by methods of formal diplomacy alone."

Last year a step in the direction in which the Secretary is now going was taken. A resolution which I sponsored resulted in the United States participation in an association of NATO legislators, then being formed, which held its first successful meeting in Paris last summer, and which formed itself into a continuing body.

Therefore, I would say to the Secretary as he leaves tomorrow that he will find the ground already well-plowed for his mission. Four years ago Dwight Eisenhower, called for "bold and imaginative" steps to further develop NATO. President Eisenhower was then General Eisenhower, commanding the NATO forces. Since he has been President there have been none of these bold and imaginative steps and indeed I believe this is the first major speech on NATO. But this, it seems to me, is the President's and the Secretary's great opportunity. They can leave on the pages of history a chapter comparable to the United Nations, the Marshall plan, NATO itself.

I would commend to them the method of exploration which my resolution proposes—a convention to be attended by representatives of the people of the nations involved. I fear that cautious discussions between cautious diplomats will result in nothing if they occur in a vacuum—but coupled with simultaneous exploration on the part of the people in convention—then we might take that step toward world peace and general prosperity which we all seek.

East Coast Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, in a few days the Civil Aeronautics Board will hear arguments in the long-pending east coast case. For many Atlantic seaboard Members of this body, the Board's forthcoming decision is of vital, if not crucial importance.

We represent areas along an airway that is the most heavily traveled in the Nation, perhaps in the world. For years, we have had to endure utterly inadequate north-south air transport. This is a matter of record. I speak also from personal experience, on your part and mine.

Between Boston and Miami, only one carrier offers through, one-plane service. Between New York and Miami, this company shares as much of the traffic as they can accommodate, with limited operations in and out of intermediate points.

This promises to be the year when the Civil Aeronautics Board will act to designate a third, and perhaps a fourth carrier to meet the urgent need for additional and improved service between the Northeast and Florida.

It is in this latter connection, Mr. Speaker, as a Member from the New England region, that I speak today. The Civil Aeronautics Board is clearly a quasi-judicial agency, independent of the legislative branch. But it is my hope that the Board will fully weigh the merits of the case it is now considering in terms of the intent and will of the Congress, as set forth in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

The declaration of national air transportation policy embodied in that statute and the criteria established by the Congress call for rulings in the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

I submit that the New England region, the oldest industrial area of the Nation, and the home of the first domestic airline established at what is now Logan International Airport in Boston in 1925, is deserving of greater consideration than was indicated by the Board's examiner, Mr. Thomas L. Wrenn, in his recommendation last April 3.

In his report, Mr. Wrenn proposed that Delta Airlines, which already flies between New York and Atlanta and provides connecting service to Miami, be certificated to make direct New York-Miami flights as the third carrier on the East coast route.

The New England congressional delegation reacted with dismay to this finding, Mr. Speaker. So did some of our New York City and Baltimore colleagues, as I recall. A number of our southeastern members were equally unhappy about Mr. Wrenn's rejection of the applications of two other carriers who, I believe, should receive more favorable treatment in the impending hearing before the Board.

I refer to Northeast Airlines, one of the original certificated carriers and New England based, and to Pan American World Airways, which pioneered in international service.

The New England delegation has been on record in urging the Board to reverse Mr. Wrenn's recommendations insofar as Northeast is denied its application for extension of its route southward from New York to Miami. In the House of Representatives, virtually all regional Members share this view. This is particularly true of those from the northern New England States, which depend only on Northeast for scheduled air transportation.

In reference to Pan American World Airways, I speak for myself, Mr. Speaker, and for what I believe to be the best interests of my State, my region, and the national convenience, necessity, and advancement.

It is a fact that a high percentage of United States air passengers flying southward to Florida along the Atlantic seaboard are international passengers, bound for the Caribbean and ports of call throughout South America.

It is a fact that New England, which has played a major role since the dawn of the Union in the expansion of inter-American trade and the prestige of our Nation abroad, is more closely linked to sister nations of this hemisphere than ever before. Something more than 40 percent of all foreign investments in Latin America is New England capital.

It is a fact that in 1954 a substantial percentage of total New England industrial employment was in enterprises dependent largely on imports from Central and South America.

New England is intensely aware of its great stake in Latin America's future, thanks to such alert forces as Pan American, which inaugurated the first United States international airline in 1927, flying between Key West and Habana, Cuba, a 90-mile route which enjoyed a brisk business. From this evolved Pan American's Latin America system and its worldwide service into some 80 countries.

Pan American would offer New Englanders a direct, one-plane service from Boston to all major Latin American cities, via Miami and intermediate points, just as Pan American now flies from Logan International Airport in Boston to the major cities of Western Europe.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is sufficient traffic between the Northeast and Florida to enable as many as four competing airlines to operate profitably. I suggest that the density of traffic on this route during the peak season would not only improve immeasurably the quality of the available accommodations—thanks to the stimulus of competition—but also would eliminate the subsidies now required by Northeast and Pan American.

In Pan American's case, the end happens to be in sight for subsidies, should the company obtain authorization for expanded operations. Northeast Airlines receive proportionately high subsidies for good reasons: This small trunk carrier, 1 of the original 13 to be certificated by the Federal Government, is the only one which serves numerous communities in New England which would otherwise be without air transportation. Moreover, its short-haul routes are unprofitable for obvious reasons, and its losses due to bad weather heighten its financial problem.

Objections have been raised to Pan American's bid to enter the northeast Florida market on various grounds. It is pointed out that Pan American is the

largest overseas carrier, and therefore should be kept out of the domestic routes. Mr. Wrenn, in rejecting Pan American's argument to link its European and Latin American systems by service between the northern coterminals at Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore-Washington, and Miami, cited what he termed a "disadvantage."

Pan American's case, he observed, was based largely on the difficulty the company has "in lacking direct access to the primary sources of traffic in the United States, particularly in relationship to its Latin American services, while its competitors have superior access to those sources of traffic."

Why should Pan American be restricted by such "disadvantages" if the chief victims of such barriers to competition are the people of New England, the Middle Atlantic States, and the Baltimore-Washington area? They are clearly protesting the status quo, and it is in compliance with the public interest, convenience and necessity that the Board must make its determination.

The Board is cognizant of its duty to rule on the best means of expanding and improving northeast Florida air transportation commencing this year, in 1956. Within the airline industry, it is acknowledged that Pan American Airways is admirably equipped to inaugurate schedules immediately, in DC-7 Clippers, including the new DC-7C model, the ultimate in piston-engine airliners for long-range, high-speed travel. It is my in-

formation that these new airplanes which are currently being delivered to Pan American, can reduce flight time on the east coast route by 1 hour and 45 minutes; on the fastest transoceanic routes, by 3 hours.

We also know that Pan American is the first of the United States carriers to usher in the jet age with United States-built jet airliners now on order.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote Examiner Wrenn's most interesting substantive finding as to Pan American's qualifications for serving the Nation's foremost route—a finding which he seems to have ignored in denying the company's application.

Pan American, he wrote, "should offer 18,103 long-haul passengers, accounting for 46 million passenger miles (based on 1954 figures), their first one-carrier service would use the latest type equipment and, with equipment on order could also put jet equipment into operation as soon as it is available, would provide first-class and coach service of the best quality, could satisfy seasonal demands better than any other applicant by drawing upon its other operations, has greater net worth than any other applicant, and, according to its estimates, could provide more benefits to the taxpayers in the form of subsidy reduction than any other applicant."

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the Board will keep Mr. Wrenn's foregoing statement in mind when it undertakes to reverse him in the public interest.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 7, 1956

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as we turn to Thee, who knowest the sadness which grips our spirits, we mourn the passing from this mortal stage of one who was adored and trusted by a vast host of his fellow countrymen.

Hundreds saw him die—millions saw him live. The Nation which he loved and served saw him live across self-giving decades; for he lived and wrought with ardent passion for the preservation undimmed of the spiritual verities upon which the Republic was founded by God-fearing men.

We remember gratefully today—now that an honored seat in this Chamber is vacant—that freedom's holy light, which is America, was his creed, and that he dedicated every power of his being for its defense. Proudly he walked around freedom's ramparts which he helped to watch, perceiving with alert eyes the dire dangers which threatened her very survival in these days of her most crucial test.

We thank Thee that the burning words of his impassioned voice, as he pled for the faith that burned like fire in his bones within these hallowed walls and up and down the land, will forever be a part of the heritage of this body as he

joins the cloud of witnesses whose membership depends not on any election but upon the selection by a nation which gladly acknowledges his eminence, as he did justly, loved mercy, and walked humbly with his God.

So teach us to number our remaining days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom, and at last, like him, to enter into the inheritance of the saints in light: In the name of the Master he acknowledged the Lord of all. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. STENNIS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 28, 1956, and Thursday, May 3, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

On April 30, 1956:

S. 1188. An act to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks; and

S. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain laws of the United States with respect to counsel employed by the special committee of the Senate estab-

lished by Senate Resolution 219, 84th Congress.

On May 1, 1956:

S. 1287. An act to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system.

On May 2, 1956:

S. 1194. An act to provide for transfer of administrative jurisdiction over Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., to the Secretary of the Interior and over Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., to the Secretary of the Army; and

S. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution to authorize the printing and binding of an edition of Senate Procedure and providing the same shall be subject to copyright by the authors.

REPORT ON MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 369)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10875) to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.